

# THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW

VOL. VII

OCTOBER, 1906

NO. 4

## The Congressional Elections.

THE atmosphere of the United States in the year 1906 is heavy with scandals and lurid with exposures. The bitterest enemy of capitalist society, bent upon exhibiting relentlessly the immorality, the heartlessness and the degradation it works upon its human factors, could paint no such lamentable picture as the unpying consequences of the system itself have painted.

It is as if the dark finger of fate were touching, one after another, the secret keys of society's innermost life; and whenever men have looked at one another in the belief that the final hideous revelation has been made, Lo! another key has been depressed, and in a new quarter, thought far remote from the influence of corruption, a depth of turpitude has been revealed approaching near to infamy. The gods of the bourgeoisie; the laurel-crowned Olympians of the commercial world, have fallen ignominiously from their mountain by the disintegrating decay of their own manhood; and their worshipers stand aghast and bewildered, torn from the moorings to all they had deemed steadfast and moral.

What the socialist propaganda could not have done to the props of capitalist society in a decade of agitation has been done since the last congressional election by the rotting away of the social foundations themselves.

It is in times like these; times of the breaking up of old faiths;

that men are spurred by necessity to scrutinize the conditions of their social polity and its objective expression, and are led to seek new political affiliations.

The congressional elections of 1906 are important, therefore, not alone because they afford us the interesting opportunity of registering our total national vote; they are important because the dramatic objective crumbling of the commercial *morale* makes the fall of 1906 a time of especial harvest for the socialist cause. We harvest this year, as always, the crop of our own sowing; but we harvest also, if we can rise to it, the rich crop sown by the logic of events.

The predicament of the two old parties is at present an interesting one. The investigations of the business methods of the huge life-insurance companies has exhibited both the Republican and Democratic party agents as equally the paid servants of the master class, reaching eagerly for the wages of betrayed trust. But while officially both parties are instruments of the privileged economic class, there is an interesting division in each, caused by the deepening conflict between the great capitalists and the little capitalists over the division of the product of the working class.

This division rent the Democratic party in 1896, and the rent is not yet mended. A similar division now actually divides the Republican leaders in several states, and by President's Roosevelt's championing the cause of the little capitalists; but no election has yet been held in which the result of this division might be officially registered, and the coming congressional elections will not do it.

In fact, outside of the vote cast directly for socialism the elections this fall will be wholly ambiguous. Their real import will not be disclosed until the presidential election of 1908. There is no way of determining whether the Republican votes in the coming elections are cast from habit of mind, for Wall street directly, or for the little capitalists in revolt under the leadership of the president; and so long as the votes can be harvested in the same basket there is no danger to the official representatives of privilege. But the congressional agents of the American plutocracy now realize fully that their direct constituents are hopelessly outnumbered by the little capitalists, and as economic privilege now rests upon craft instead of force, are prepared to tread softly. Many of them are to present the amusing spectacle of men making a campaign upon a platform in which they do not believe, and which they have been well paid to obstruct, pointing to the record of the last congressional session as a reason for their reelection and as their justification of the "reform" spirit of the



Republican party. It is a matter of record that every measure of importance to the little capitalists which was enacted into law at the last session was passed against the wishes of the majority, and against the economic interest of those who have been the employers of the Republican party. Political lives were in danger. There were to be elections this fall. It is better politics to concede a point or two and keep the whip in hand, than to risk losing the whip altogether.

The Democratic party is absolutely without campaign material owing to its hopelessly unstrategic support in Congress of the measures of a Republican executive. That the leaders realize this is evidenced by their ignoring of the coming campaign and its direct issues, and by the frantic fixing of their attention upon the presidential campaign of 1908 as the tactic most useful in holding the vote this fall. The apparent equanimity with which plutocracy now regards the possible candidacy of Mr. Bryan gives rise to visions of offices once more to be enjoyed by the Democratic faithful.

In this political scramble however, the working class has no more of a vital interest than it had in the last session of Congress, in which its needs and aspirations not once received a passing thought.

The working class in American politics has been mainly in the position of a rabbit for the privilege of devouring which a greedy big dog and a vicious little dog are fighting. It has not yet occurred to either of the dogs that the rabbit itself may have a right to life;—it has hardly yet occurred to the rabbit. The rabbit has been usually inclined to favor the little dog, either blinded by the amount of dust his scramble kicks up, or believing it more agreeable perhaps to be devoured in smaller bites. In the present contest the big dog has been getting so much of the rabbit that the little dog has called in his neighbors to help him. The only real interest to the rabbit in such a contest, if he were capable of analyzing the situation, is the fact that he will finally be devoured by one or the other, or both.

The growth of the vote of the Socialist party is evidence of the coming of the rabbit to consciousness; and the work of the socialist in the coming campaign is to help the discontented worker clearly to see his real position, as a bone of contention whose rights are not considered.

There will be nothing either in the republican or democratic appeals at the hustings this year to impair the vote for socialism previously cast or to prevent the adding to the same of many thousand votes which have in the past two years become class-conscious. The danger in the coming elections lies, as it always

does in times of special social unrest, in the local candidacies of individual men who seek to market public discontent for their own political profit, by fulminations against certain flagrant corruptions, and by the advocacy of radical enforcements of capitalist law. The present state of the American mind renders it peculiarly susceptible to such influences. It is aflame with middle class wrath against "business methods" and "captains of industry" and wants things mended tomorrow, by putting everybody in jail. The facts now acknowledged are so bad as to make the testimony of the big millionaire worse than useless in his own defense. As a class the millionaires have been caught in habitual and wholesale falsehood, and thieves and harlots are sooner believed than the coadjutors of Hanna and Aldrich.

This all makes for unphilosophical punitive revolt instead of philosophical revolution because it is so largely personal; and the district attorney who picks out and punishes a big criminal becomes at once a bourgeois hero and presidential possibility, because his mind and action are on the plane of the popular feeling of revenge.

The duty of the socialist now as always is to make the workingman class-conscious and weld him into the party organization. The tendency to follow off after some middle-class reformer in the hope of getting immediate relief from some popular ill, must be met and overcome by a slow and patient educational process. What is wanted is not to put plutocracy in jail; it is to put it to work. The result will be achieved by the abolition of its privileges; not by locking it up.

Any action or policy which divides the vote of the Socialist party, or diverts even a portion of it into channels of mere reform, whether cast for another party or for an individual, introduces an element of confusion and leads to sure disintegration and discouragement of the rank and file. It is not absolutely necessary to elect socialists to office in order to make progress; but it is supremely necessary to maintain a compact and threatening body of class-conscious voters, who invariably vote as a unit, and who take on steadily from year to year an accretion of their own kind. In the face of such a growing power and its clearly outlined demands, all the relief measures which can be given the workers under the present system will be conceded one at a time by the beneficiaries of the system. Any disruption of this compact body, however slight, brings joy to the privileged class, for it is the storm barometer of the life of that class and the object of its keenest and subtlest attack. It may be quite safe for our representatives who shall once be elected to legislative offices to make in their public effort such combinations with other indi-



viduals or parties in the same public bodies as may be thought of strategic value in advancing the cause of the workers or crippling the capitalist class; because, behind such representatives stands this compact body watchful, alert and comprehending, unharmed and untouched by the sword play of its agents. But any combination, trading, or so-called opportune tactic, however briefly maintained, which affects the compact body itself, or leads any of its members nationally or locally into individual action independent of it, is more disastrous and more blighting to a cause that can only succeed through solidarity, than any open onslaught capitalism ever can hurl against it.

The guarding therefore of our compact revolutionary organization is the fundamental and vital duty of every member of the party, not to be lost sight of in any conjuncture, however promising of immediate gain; for it is the only weapon vouchsafed to us with which to sever the bonds of the working class woven through long ages of tyranny.

There should be good and legitimate progress for the Socialist party in these days of discontent, and literature suited to the time and its tendencies should not be withheld. A long look ahead should be taken in each congressional district, suitable and able candidates trained and disciplined for ultimate service, and a perpetual and untiring propaganda carried on until our ballotings are successful. It is the legislative offices, in which our representatives need assume no responsibility for the upholding or enforcement of capitalist laws, and are free to exercise their critical faculties to the utmost, which will be of most use to us at present.

We can hardly look upon the legislative bodies of England, Germany, France, Italy and the other European countries having their fighting circles of socialists, without a feeling akin to humiliation that here, where the ballot is unrestricted, the working class has waited so long to be shown the way to economic and political independence; waited hat in hand and on bended knee at the lobby chambers of the political lackeys of the capitalist class, supplicating for the things which the proper use of its ballots would equip it imperatively to demand.

At this moment, more than at any previous period in the history of socialism in the United States, a socialist member of Congress is vitally needed. In a western prison there lie incarcerated men who have devoted their lives to the liberation of the working class; men of ability, integrity and unblemished honor; socialists; members of our own party; victims of the conspiracy of a capitalist organization whose ruthless violation of capitalism's own laws in pursuit of vengeance for impaired profits, testi-

fies to the splendid strength and manhood of these imprisoned men. These socialists cannot be fraudulently condemned and executed for a crime of which they are innocent unless we fail in bringing the facts adequately before the country. Capitalist anarchy in Colorado can withstand every influence except that of public light upon its methods. A socialist member of Congress could focus the attention of the entire country upon the trial of Haywood, Moyer, and Pettibone, and confuse and put to rout the reckless and merciless enemies of the Western Federation of Miners.

It is therefore supremely essential that in every congressional district where there may be the remotest chance this year of electing a socialist to Congress (and especially in those in which reasonable assurance exists that the socialist vote may be fairly counted) a herculean effort be put forth to elect. In such districts speaking and the distribution of literature should not alone be relied upon. The organization should be whipped into perfect working order and a systematic canvas made of every voter in the district. Every man should be personally interviewed and personally requested to vote for the socialist candidate for Congress, even if he cannot be persuaded to vote the rest of the ticket; and the vital and critical reason for the solicitation should be given him. Many a middle class man who habitually votes an old party ticket would respond through sympathy to such solicitation, and the worker who would not vote to help insure justice to a wrongly condemned leader of organized labor should indeed be hard to find.

Once we have a representative in Congress, day by day to interpret passing events in the light of the socialist philosophy the effect of our propaganda will be cumulative. A new interest and a new life will come to the party, and those who long have borne the heat of the day will at least see the beginnings of the fruit of their labors.

Already the long maintained conspiracy of silence has been shattered; the world's best literature is to-day aflame with aspiration for a better order. The rush and hurry of the tremendously rapid culmination of the capitalist system, changing economic bases, and with them habits of thought, is bringing the world to a time of great danger, and of great promise. Amid the confusion and chaos of a crumbling and outworn society is there now enough of nobility, of true manhood in us to lay the foundations of an enduring state?

This question every man upon whose heart and brain has fallen the awful light of the socialist ideal must answer for himself.

FRANKLIN WENTWORTH.



## The Cost of Competition.\*

AN interesting phenomenon for the student of our contemporary life to watch is the gradual development of a school of native American Socialists, who have been made what they are by direct contact with reality, rather than by the influence of our teachings. Such men as David Graham Phillips, Charles Edward Russell, Lincoln Steffens and Thorstein Veblen, who do not even call themselves Socialists—but have a new vocabulary which they have invented for themselves. Lincoln Steffens in his *Studies of Graft* has traced the disease back to its fundamental cause, which is Capitalism; but he does not use the word capitalism, he calls it “big business”; he does not talk about class-domination—he calls it “the System.” In the same way Professor Veblen, in his two extraordinary books, “*The Theory of the Leisure Class*” and “*The Theory of Business Enterprise*,” has analyzed the tendencies of the hour entirely independently of any previous speculations, and has laid the foundations for a native American school of political economy.

Another book of this sort has just been sent to me by the publishers. It is written by a man of whom I never heard, and who is entirely unknown in the Socialist movement. He is professor of steam engineering in the Worcester Polytechnic Institute, and has, apparently, been led to his investigations through his acquaintance with Bellamy. He has written a book called “*The Cost of Competition*,” on which I understand he was at work for seven years. I can readily believe it, for it is a tremendous thing. It is a book which should be immediately taken up by the Socialists; it should be read and analyzed by the thinking men in our movement, and its arguments should be made familiar to our party workers.

It is a volume of over six hundred pages; a treatise upon economics, entirely free from all the jargon of the schools, by a man who keeps in close touch with actual life, and who has conscience and moral intelligence, as well as analytical power and scientific training. For instance, he is defining value, and explains that the ultimate test of value is “the power to produce

---

\**The Cost of Competition*, by Sidney A. Reeve, McClure, Phillips & Co., Cloth, 617 pp., \$2.00.

life;" it is somewhat unusual, in treatises upon "the dismal science," to find the phrase "value" qualified as follows:

As the flotsam of life is tossed before him for consideration, as love, riches or institutions, as knowledge, opportunity or inspiration, are held up for his comparative estimation, the decision, speaking broadly, always finally turns upon the question: "How much of human life will it support or elevate?" Temporarily or locally fancy or ignorance may warp the judgment, and this rightful arbiter of the issue be forgotten; but sooner or later nature reduces the question to its lowest terms: "The greatest good of the greatest number." That which brings the opportunity of life to the greatest number, or in the greatest purity, or in the greatest complexity of composition, inevitably survives. The fruitless fancy, the vain ambition, the selfish greed, the malevolent craze, succumbs. Art may flourish, empire may widen, knowledge may take root and grow, culture and refinement may be of the most extreme, aristocracy may flaunt its heraldic emblems and prune its ancient genealogical trees; yet if the solid promise of unlimited opportunity for future billions be not incorporated therein nature sets upon it her stamp of disapproval. It withers and dies, is buried and lost.

He proceeds to set forth the nature of wealth, of the processes of production and consumption, and of exchange. The perfect type of exchange, unalloyed by any other feature, he finds within our modern, highly-organized industries, such as great factories, or trusts. Competition has been entirely banished from the internal structure of these great organizations; complete co-operation and systemization of all parts have been attained. There is a Central Office, so-called, which superintends the entire business, and exchanges the products of various departments *without profit*; the resulting product being the work of no individual workman, but the fruit of their common toil. No one owns anything which he produces.

"This absence of legal ownership," our author continues, "or of sense of personal possession applies to almost every step in the entire modern productive system. Each man works for wages, not for the sake of making things for his own gratification. Here and there is a small factory which is superintended, more or less, by its owner; there are even still some where workman and proprietor are identical; but they are small in size, unimportant in number and character when compared with the more fully developed productive enterprises, and they are on the steady decrease. ....

Even in those cases where the owner is present and spends a portion of his time in superintending the productive processes of his mill (as contrasted with the commercial processes of his selling-office), this distinction must ever be clear: That during that portion of his time he is a superintendent, and not an owner. The portion of his income which is creditable to this portion of his time, equal to the value produced by that portion of his services, should be charged against the enterprise and credited to him as a salary for superintendence. In economic parlance it would be known as wages.

But this system of simple exchange does not prevail throughout the whole of society; it is modified by another feature known as *Barter*. In order to illustrate Barter the author imagines the



activities of two primitive tribes: one fishermen, the other hunters, who produce in order to exchange; and here a trouble arises.

"The community of savages has no means for determining even the average valuation of the goods by the community; it does not possess sufficiently intelligent organization to perceive things as a unit. It has, in short, no Central Office. Therefore is recourse necessarily taken, purely as a matter of primitive ignorance, to individual valuation as a determinant of price, and the exchange is made upon that basis. The parties are left strictly to themselves. .... Thus arose the 'free social contract.' As civilization advanced it has been found necessary to interfere, to the extent of prohibition, with every other sort of duello. With barter the interference has as yet been only partial."

This Barter the author proceeds to analyze and define, in a chapter of really extraordinary keenness. You will observe, as you read the extracts that follow, that he is proceeding to set forth the ills of modern society in a new and most convincing manner. Before the barter begins, the *productive labor* was already completed; no amount of keenness in bargaining upon the part of either party increases in the slightest the quantity of the fish or game on hand.

"This fundamental fact is to be noted at the start, to be reiterated and emphasized at every possible point: *Production was already finished and could not be extended by any sort of further effort.* There lay the game and the fish on the market. No further effort could or did pretend to increase their number, their weight or their life-supporting value in any way. .... It is the proportionate *distribution of wealth* between the two parties alone which barter aims to influence and to modify. For, as the result of exchange alone, at the natural price, each man would depart from the market with five hares and fifteen fish. But in barter each sees his opportunity, as stated before, *to secure wealth without producing it*; the only way, of course, being to get away from the other fellow some of the wealth which the latter has produced. If the hunter, for instance, by persuasion or deception as to the quality of either of the commodities or as to their natural price, or by securing a time for exchange when the fisherman is in especial need of game, or by selecting a place where violence may be threatened without danger of punishment by the tribe, or by the promise of influence with a sweetheart, a chieftain or an enemy,—if by any such means he can force his neighbor to accept one hare for four fish instead of one for three, then, as the result of the barter, the hunter will depart from the market with five hares and twenty fish and the fisherman will return home with five hares and only ten fish,—to what domestic fate we may leave to the imagination.

Herein arises the second important characteristic of the situation: If the fisherman finds life more endurable upon a daily diet of five hares and ten fish than he did upon thirty fish alone, he will return to the market on the morrow, to be again outdone by the hunter at barter; if not, he will remain away until the hunter becomes more moderate in his demands. If, on the other hand, life would be more enjoyable for the fisherman even upon so low a diet as five hares and only five fish than it would upon thirty fish alone, and if the limits of either the hunter's seductive or overbearing disposition or of his command of intrigue have not yet been reached, these processes will most naturally be expanded until the hunter's daily income has become five hares and twenty-five

fish, while the fisherman's is reduced to five hares and five fish. For this is the line of least resistance.

From these considerations is established this law: *Barter added to Exchange inevitably tends to directly reduce the income of the loser to the minimum which leaves life at all preferable to the more primitive level of existence without exchange.*

Such would be the intercourse between hunter and fisherman if the latter were a quiet, unaggressive individual, devoted to his day's work and knowing little and caring less about diplomacy, intrigue or antagonism—as, most fortunately, is true of the majority of mankind. But let it be supposed, on the other hand, that the fisherman who greeted the hunter turned out to be one of his own ilk, matching him evenly in ability to barter. Then would result two things:

(1) Each would return home, on the average, after all their dicker-ing, with the five hares and fifteen fish which each would have had *had they exchanged without any barter at all*: that is, at the natural price.

(2) The natural hope of being able to effect a better result than this, legitimately supported by the very high reward allotted to barter, per unit of time, when it is successful at all, would lead to their spending more and more time each day at bargaining with each other, until the time devoted to production became so restricted that the quantities of fish and game brought to market no longer tempted quarrel over them. This hope of quicker and easier success by barter than by production is the gambler's hope. It is seen to bring the gambler's reward.

From this second consideration arises the law: *Barter added to Exchange inevitably tends to restrict the productivity of both parties to the barter to the minimum which leaves existence at all preferable to the more primitive level attainable without exchange.*

Combining these two laws, there results this all-important conclusion: *Barter is a process parasitical upon the Exchange so destructive to the latter and, with it, to the Production dependent upon exchange, and to the Life engaged in both and dependent upon them for support, that it limits their existence and activity to the minimum which will afford a supporting food-supply to the barter which preys upon them. This minimum is slightly greater than the productivity possible without either exchange or barter, but is vastly less than that possible with pure exchange alone."*

The evils of this system are two-fold: (1) The wrong done to the individual less capable as a barterer; and (2) The wrong done to the community in the consumption of time and nervous energy in useless, because unproductive activity.

"The first of these is plainly visible in the elementary illustration. In modern times it has very greatly increased in magnitude, by the exaggeration of the unbalance between the contending parties far beyond what it could be between any two individuals, by the combination of individuals on the selling side with no corresponding combination on the buying side against it. It is this which is the foundation of all of the current outcry against 'the trusts.' But in this the wrong has grown only in magnitude, not character.

"The second of these two wrongs is by no means so easily discernible. In the elementary illustration it is obscure partly because of the deliberately assumed lack of any coherent social entity which might be palpably wronged by the mere existence of the barter, and partly because of the obvious freedom of other individuals, in so elastic an environment as this elementary society, to operate quite



independently of the haggling pair. In modern society both of these conditions are absent. Society is a unit, whether it will own up to it or not; the institutions adopted by the majority, which never sees clearly what it is doing, must be accepted by the minority. In its modern development, however, this second form of wrong is still obscure, not because it is small or unimportant but because of the blinding intricacy of the field in which it is active.

Yet it is most important to call attention at this point to the fact that it is this second form of offense involved in barter, the one against society at large, which now constitutes by far its most important phase. It has not only grown enormously in magnitude, but its ramifications have worked their insidious way throughout the social structure until the entire fabric of individuals and institutions, material, intellectual and moral, has been permeated and distorted by its poisonous presence.....It is not the profit-making, the profit which is extorted from the consumer, which does him the most harm; it is the profit-keeping, the time spent by the barterer in antagonism and failure, which undermines his neighbor's purchasing-power and which robs the rich and the poor alike of their natural heritage in a new continent: material welfare, peace on earth, and good will to men. It is not gold, but the legalized strife for gold, which is the root of all evil."

"Success in either sort of contest," the author continues:

"May be forwarded by superiority in either one of two fields: in production or in bargaining. In the first field arise a natural, wholesome desire on the part of each healthy worker to surpass his fellows: selfish, if you please, but nevertheless conducive to greater wealth in the community and to greater health and wealth for the individual. In the second field will also naturally arise a similar desire for personal superiority; but that it is unwholesome for both individual and community in its results and quite in contrast to the first it is the task of these following pages to demonstrate.

This desire, evinced in the field of production, we shall call *emulation*. That in the second field we shall call either *barter* or *bargaining* or *competition*, almost synonymously.

All of this activity is necessitated by the fact that there exists no Central-Office, with authority to ascertain the real value and so to do away with Barter. There is no need of other preliminary to exchange, after production, than the determination of an equitable price. Such a determination would appear, to the rational investigator, to be a mere question of accurate record of individual production, a purely intellectual question, its peaceful scientific settlement, in a civilized community, to be accomplished by reason and to be protected by law. But the reference of the matter to barter for settlement allows the public reliance to lapse, instead, to a balance of personal forces which are quite other than rational; in reality to the clumsy method of approximation known as the trial by nerve-duello. In all forms of duello success may be attained only by doing harm to one's opponent; but for refinement of veiled malevolence, of result if not of will, the duello which was relied upon in questions of criminal law before the Carlovingian kings cannot compare with the form of duello known as barter which is relied upon by the twentieth century for the settlement of all questions of economics.

The writer then proceeds to further elucidate this idea of Barter:

"In its present form, complicated as it is by the intricacy of modern life far away from the simple elementary bargain between fisherman and hunter which was adduced for the sake of illustration, barter may be defined as the forced passage through one's hands of the ownership of either goods or the chance to labor at the greatest possible profit to the temporary owner, or, what is the same thing, *at the greatest possible cost to the community of the value concerned.* This means that, in the case of goods, the resultant price will be the highest which may possibly tempt purchasers; in the case of labor it means that the lowest wage will prevail which will possibly tempt labor to exertion. The standard phrase for this method in railroad economics is 'charging all the traffic will bear.' The same practice is the standard, and the only successful, policy in all forms of business."

The evils of this system he exhibits by the illustration of a mill-owner who wishes to purchase an engine and who is besieged by ten different salesmen each anxious, not to help him in getting what he wants, but in getting out of him the highest price for something which he may not want at all. The waste of this method is obvious. Only one man can possibly secure the order; the rest are inevitably doomed to failure.

"As to price," the author continues, "that shows the worst failure of all. The engines were already in the seller's hands, perfect and complete, before negotiation opened. When it is concluded, one of them is transferred to the purchaser's ownership, absolutely without alteration or improvement, *at just about twice its completed cost as it left the factory.* For, of course the selling-houses are not doing business at a loss,— 'for their health,' as the phrase goes. If they sell an engine only once out of every six expeditions made by their salesmen, that one sale must bring in enough gross profit to cover the cost of all six negotiations, with a margin over for net profit. It is inevitable that the consumer shall pay the whole cost of competition. *But what he loses the seller does not gain.* Most of it has been lost in abortive effort."

The next chapter is entitled "Specialization in Barter."

Reverting again to primitive illustrations of economic principle, rather than to early periods of economic history, it may easily be imagined how the illustrative community of fisher-folk soon gravitated into a better plan for barter with the hunters than the one previously described. The competition between the fishermen for the privilege of exchange would soon develop the fact that some one or more among them possessed exceptional talent for driving a bargain. Hence, it would pay the majority of the fishermen to strike an agreement with these individuals, saying: "You represent us at market, taking charge of our fish there, exchanging them for hares upon the best basis you can secure, and bring us back the hares. For your time and trouble we will then pay you in both fish and hares." The hunters, perceiving the gain which the fishermen had effected by thus organizing themselves, would follow suit. Thus would the community divide itself, for the first time, into the two fundamental classes of modern economic organization:

(1) The Producers of Wealth, the greater in numbers and, on the average, the lesser in skill; and

(2) The Bargainers for Valuation, in the minority as to numbers, but embodying the bulk of the community's fund of nervous energy.



After this explanation Professor Reeves is in position to define two terms which he uses throughout the balance of the book: *Production*, and *Dissipation*. Production is all that social activity which is devoted toward the creation of Value, by the transformation and transportation of raw material. Dissipation is all that activity which is devoted toward the control of Valuation, by barter or competition over price. For instance: The author illustrates the various processes incidental to the superintendence of labor, under our present system. These combine two distinct duties:

(1) The organization and education of labor of an inferior degree of intelligence into the maximum possible efficiency;

(2) The exhortation or compulsion of labor which has already contracted to perform certain duties at an agreed price to fulfillment of its agreement.

The first is purely productive effort. It naturally should, and it usually does, meet with the heartiest co-operation on the part of subordinate labor; the understanding of the laborer may sometimes be small, but the spirit is willing. *Whenever this is not so it is because of the constant presence of (2) and its association, in the mind of the laborer, with the superintendent's every effort.*

The second is purely barter in character. The work was agreed upon at a fixed price per day. In reaching that agreement the laborer is at all times conscious of the fact that the wage is low because its every diminution goes into his employer's pocket; what he doesn't get as wages the employer gets in the form of profit. He accepts because he can get no better. He knows, too, that the less which he does per day for a given wage, *all of his class uniting in the same policy*, the greater will be the wage per day. All of these ideas unite to form in labor's mind a most natural antagonism to the desires of any agent of its employer's interests; which, for this portion of his time and effort, the superintendent is. The laborer's will therefore assumes an attitude of resistance. He embodies psychologically for the first time (and therefore gets the blame for) what the wage-system has embodied causatively as a fundamental institution in our static law, viz.: antagonism of interests as the sole guide in the distribution of wealth. This resistance constitutes Labor's chief method of barter, whether displayed at the moment or deliberately systematized in organized effort, in strike or boycott. In this sense the laborer as well as the superintendent spends a portion of his time in barter; but it is a very small portion of the whole for the former.....

He proceeds to analyze the economic organism, and to trace out the consequences of dissipation in every field. He shows by means of statistics and diagrams what is the relation between consumption and dissipation; how the proportion of the latter is constantly increasing. He shows that one of the consequences of barter is the "starvation-wage."

*In each class or level of productive effort, as a result of internal competition for the opportunity to labor, the majority of its individuals are led to accept the least income upon which they can succeed in surviving, reproducing and maintaining their social and economic level. This income is known as THE STARVATION-WAGE for that class.*

Another consequence is unemployment. He has explained

the law that so long as any competition takes place, the purchasing power of the entire community must be less than its natural producing power by the proportion of that competitive to the remaining productive effort; consequently "the average proportion of Enforcedly Idle in the several classes of industry, or of the Submerged Tenth to the total population, is a direct function of the proportion prevailing between Competitive and Total Economic effort."

All of these illustrations occur in the first of the book, which is entitled, "The Economic Cost." The second half is entitled, "The Ethical Cost." The author shows the cost to the winners and the cost to the losers, and the cost to the whole community. He analyzes all the moral, intellectual and artistic waste incidental to the competitive struggle. For instance, he inserts two or three striking photographs. One of them shows a city street corner with stores placarded over with scores of advertising signs: "We Retire For Ever." "Suits and Overcoats Must be Sold at Once." "Magic Insect Powder." "Cholera Mixture, 25 Cents." "Ice-Cold Soda Water," etc. This nightmare of hideousness is labeled, with gentle irony, "The Competitive Distribution of Information." On another page there is an illustration of the Co-operative Distribution of Information — the magnificent eight-million-dollar Library of Congress.

One of the chapters in this portion of the book is entitled "Future Progress Without Poverty." This gives the author's remedy for the evils which he has been describing. Strange and unbelievable as it may seem, he does not go to pieces upon this part of his work, as so many of our independent investigators do; he explains the perfectly simple and beautiful plan: *the elimination of barter from exchange*. It is, in its essence, identical with the proposals of proletarian Socialism, but the author does not seem to know this; he states his plan from his own point of view, and with his own admirable simplicity.

For the abolition of economic dissipation it is necessary that we should adopt as the sole guiding principle of economic justice, the conservation to each individual of the value which he produces; in other words, *a Central-Office must be established to determine the cost of every product*.

"This is something," says the author, "which will appeal to the practical business man." Then, to secure the end of justice, all that is necessary is that the laws of the land, backed by public opinion, shall provide—

"1. That each man's produce, be it what it may, *must be sold at cost to the community as a whole*, represented by its public agent, *and to the community only*; in other words, that the legal ownership of all value produced within the community shall be vested as completely in its Central Office as is now the case within every factory. The community



must guarantee to each producer the full value of his efforts, and to itself the most perfect freedom of exchange. Those are the sole duties of civilized Exchange. The only known method of meeting them is that the public Central Office, fixing prices at a money-rate determined by a pure balance between supply and demand, as free from barter as is the purchase of postage-stamps. The community must also prohibit any attempt upon the part of any individual at acquiring Value by any other means than by producing it. This last, at present, it does not pretend to do. Yet it is a policy the justice of which the most ambitious profit-seeker cannot publicly decry.

2. That, as the only means necessary to enforce the preceding, all prices, whether of commodities, of manual labor, or of intellectual service, must be publicly fixed and publicly varied, and not subject to private, individual manipulation. They are to be fixed, naturally,

(a) By public officials, acting publicly upon current public records, such as the census-bulletins; all ledger-accounts, bank-accounts, check-books, etc., being considered at all times public;

(b) So that the price just equals the cost; that is, so that the commodity in question shows as little deficit or surplus of cash, from year to year, as possible;

(c) So that the volume of supply shall be similarly adjusted to meet the volume of demand, so that as little deficit or surplus of goods as possible shall occur."

If this is done, Professor Reeve is of the opinion that it does not in the least matter who "owns" the capital utilized by the nation in its productive enterprises. The plain way to accomplish what is desired is to publicly condemn all effort at making any profit whatever; in the first place, by adopting the following

"Fundamental rules for guidance in the abolition of dissipation:

(1) The salaried superintendent of production must be the public commissioner for all decisions as to prices concerning the commodity he produces;

(2) He must be the last one to handle any funds concerned in that production.

(3) His own income must be in the form of a salary, publicly declared and invariable, except by public processes, having no direct dependence upon the momentary quantity of goods handled.

The first two of these methods constitute exactly the present accepted policy in all efficient factory-organization of any size. The third is the present accepted policy in dealing with all public men, and works efficiently.

In short, it is proposed to take the factory-owner at his word and to follow his own example. We propose to organize all workers, over and under both, as the employees of the community, in the same manner as he now organizes "his" employees. For it must ever be remembered that, if the policy so frequently urged by commercial men in speaking of public affairs, viz.: that the people's government ought to follow the shining example of the business-world, ought to carry on its administration in a business-like way,—if this policy were once seriously adopted by the people, *the immediate result would be that every barterer, every purely commercial man in the country, would find himself out of a job and without an income*; for the entire country would then be organized upon the plan upon which he now runs the factory-production in which he

takes no part, in which he permits not one iota of individual profit-making nor even of profit-seeking.

How very curiously this falls in with the invitation which *Wilshire's Magazine* recently extended to Mr. Rockefeller, to accept the position of manager of the oil department of the Co-operative Commonwealth!

UPTON SINCLAIR, *Author of "The Jungle."*



## The New University of Brussels.

YOUTH is the depository of social forces. Its endeavors form an excellent criterion by which to measure a future dominated by them.

The mature people of all ages have understood the fatality of this truth and made efforts to direct education toward ideas which they thought to be in accordance with their hopes, prejudices or interests. Especially higher education—as the university—was always influenced by the predominating wishes of the mature minds. When they loved progress the aim of the university was the broadening of the integral capacities of the youth—when they doubted in its benefits the universities were degraded to serve their class-interests, becoming strongholds of stagnation and conservatism.

In the nineteenth century, with the rapid and formidable organization of the capitalistic régime the influence of the ruling classes upon the attitude of the universities has been more accentuated and, with a few laudable exceptions, the universities of the old and new world have taken more and more a reactionary tendency and sometimes even a retrograde policy.

Thus we see universities openly taking up the defense of the capitalistic society on the one hand by glorifying its success and organization, and on the other, by suppressing the individual opinion of advanced professors. The teachings of radical professors,—who served scientific truth and not the interests of the ruling classes,—were consciously misrepresented; public opinion has been aroused against them with the ultimate aim to rob them of their chairs.

The youth, frequenting the universities has not received objective criticism or neutral explanation of present or past society but has been impregnated with notions defending the position of the capitalistic classes. The rough material which came to the universities went through an elaborate process of softening and moulding, leaving the university machine as a perfect and elastic material,—ready to fill without hesitation all orders coming from the ruling classes.

But the admirable effervescence of thought, sentiment and action going on among the “lower classes” has seized a considerable part of the students in all the important European universities. They have become influenced by the supreme idea that life is really lived only when one is not looking after ones own interests but co-operating in a struggle for the betterment of humanity. Their eyes were opened. They realized the hidden tend-

encies of the universities, they detected the base and utilitarian conception of the teachings they heard from "prominent men." On many occasions they rebelled against the mean manipulations of the authorities directed against professors who dared to express convictions opposed to established opinions.

The universities tried to stop this new intellectual development sometimes with autocratic measures, which only intensified the discontent of the students. Many times they rose openly to defend free thought and the persecuted professors and to support their societies, engaged in the work of uplifting themselves as well as the wholly ignorant classes.

In many cases they succeeded, the authorities yielding to the powerful opposition of the students.

The result of this fight was that we find to-day in all European universities of high standing professors teaching radical thought and we see incorporated in the program of courses those sciences—especially social sciences—which hitherto have been either wholly neglected or suppressed.

By the student's support the broad social tendencies found a place in the universities, hitherto dominated by class interests.

Where the radical tendency was disregarded a final conflict was unavoidable. The struggling professors and students took over the work so ignored and briskly refused by the old universities. The scission led to the foundation of new universities. In Brussels, in Paris, and recently in Budapest, schools, universities of social sciences have been founded with the purpose of diffusing modern thought.

\* \* \*

The struggle which led to the foundation of the New University of Brussels was severe.

In 1834, a few years after the revolution, the Free University was founded in Brussels by Theodore Verhaegen. The idea of Verhaegen was to compete with the propaganda of the Catholic University of Louvain and establish a place for free thought.

The Free University developed rapidly. But in the same measure that its pecuniary conditions became more and more advantageous it became more and more dependent on those factors from which its financial sources sprang.

The modern standpoint from which some professors threw light on the mysteriously dark conceptions about state, law, economics and philosophy after a while became disagreeable to the directing authorities. Hector Denis, the great socialist and Guillaume de Greef, the widely appreciated economist, who had been entrusted with chairs before the spirit of the university was wholly prostituted, were attacked by a professor charged by the university itself with this degrading work.

This outrageous attitude taken by the authorities against the loved professors and their esteemed teachings made it perfectly clear to the students that free thought in the "Free University" was but a farce.

Offended in their inmost convictions the students decidedly opposed their will to that of the university authorities and a series of partial insurrections took place.

Soon after upon the proposal of the rector of the university, Hector Denis, the committee of administration of the said university opened a chair for Elisée Reclus, the most illustrious geographer and philosopher. But this noble and courageous decision was withdrawn taking for a pretext the anarchist troubles of 1894 in Paris. The university decided to postpone Reclus' course giving as an excuse his anarchism; which was in reality purely philosophical.

The Belgian intellectuals were outraged. They saw in that action of intolerance a direct attack on the spirit of liberty and international hospitality hitherto the glory of their country. Emphatic demonstrations spontaneously answered this offense, committed against the liberty of science in the person of one of its most glorious sons, of a man who condemned for deportation, after the Commune of Paris, had obtained his release upon the initiative of Darwin, acting in the name of international science.

The students were the first to mobilize their forces. Violent resolutions were discussed, accepted and posted. The professors who supported the offensive measure were received at the lectures with whistles and baked apples. Outside of the university committees were organized. In short there was a general uprising.

Hector Denis supported the action of the students and demanded that Reclus' courses should be opened without delay. Upon the committee disregarding his demand, Denis gave in his resignation. As this occurred just before examinations the new rector made some concessions in order that the students would return. However they were not conciliated but only tired of the struggle and anxious to continue their studies.

\* \* \*

The whole organization of the university became incompatible with the scientific spirit and the manifestations made in favor of free thought, in connection with the case of De Greef, Denis and Reclus, suggested the idea to found a new university, whose regenerating spirit should form an alliance of science with life.

The meeting in Brussels on March 12, 1894, voted to issue an appeal, explaining to the public the aims of the New University and containing the following important points:

"The Free University no longer expresses the spirit of large independence and high humanity which was the reason of its



foundation. It has gradually passed to the stage of **being** a simple and neutral establishment of instruction. It **represents** interests more than ideas. It no longer cares for the **moral** education of the youth. It teaches sciences without **co-ordinating** them to the great social duties. It is still turning out lawyers, physicians and professors, but no longer men and characters.

"It is not necessary that the élite of the youth shall remain in the hands of an education which does not elevate the soul and does not show that there is something else in life than personal success, material good, fruitful situations and advantageous relations. Now, when from all sides the ideas of justice and sacrifice are affirmed with incomparable energy and devotion—our children can not be left without this same ideal of superior education.

"The hour has come to try anew what Théodore Verhaegen tried sixty years ago."

This appeal which laid down the principles of an education more in harmony with the material and moral necessities of contemporaneous social life was signed by Paul Janssen, De Greef, Picard, Les Cressonnières, Lambotte and De Jongh.

The "New University" started in with a total subscription of 45,000 francs; two faculties were opened: that of philosophy and law.

The foundation met with many difficulties but the courage of the founders has never diminished.

\* \* \*

In October 1894 the New University began its functions with the faculty of Law and Philosophy and with an International Institute for Social Sciences (Institut international des hautes études). In 1895-96 the Faculty of Sciences, Faculty of Medicine, the Institute of Fermentation and the Library were opened. In 1896-97 an Institute of Hygiene, with a museum and special laboratories, then an Institute of the Natural history of Sciences, Arts and Crafts were installed.

In 1897-98 an Industrial Institute and a department of the Institute of Hygiene, a laboratory for food analysis, were opened.

The number of the professors at the beginning was 60, today they number 110. The average yearly number of students has been 125. The professors give their lectures mostly gratis. The students pay an annual fee of 150 francs. The university, whose resources are in large part donations, coming from the professors, from devoted friends and from some municipalities, has spent during the years from '94-'97 more than 320,000 francs on general expenses and 50,000 francs on laboratories. This means a great development for the new scientific organism.

The state recognized the legality of the New University at the suggestion of Burlet, a minister of education, who held radi-

cal views. This meant a great increase in prosperity as the New University had the right to give certificates.

But it was precisely that prosperity which stirred up the enemies of the New University. The press and the officials successfully contested the legal value of the certificates issued.

\* \* \*

After the state authorities ceased to accept the legal value of the certificates of the New University the program of the courses and the division into faculties naturally had to be changed. The program published in August 1899 shows us the integrating tendencies the New University had been developing.

The New University had been accentuating more and more its scientific and social character and its educating and moral role by shaking off the official program of universities the division of which into old fashioned faculties had long since been condemned by methodology and positive pedagogy. This change in the university enabled it better to co-operate in the elaboration of contemporary science.

The old Faculties of Law, Sciences, Philosophy and Medicine have been replaced by the Institute of Social Science by the Faculty of Law, by an Industrial Institute and by the Institutes of Geography, Hygiene, Fermentation and finally by the Institute of Natural History of Sciences, Arts and Crafts.

An independent and autonomous institution for University Extension was organized by the New University to scatter all over the country the conquests of science and art in a popular form.

\* \* \*

The spirit of solidarity and sacrifice were the initial forces of the New University. The corps of the professors included several members who had abandoned without regret the fruitful honorariums of the old University in order to give their lectures free of charge; they even aid the University materially. Such devotion to science and humanity is unprecedented.

\* \* \*

The present organization of the New University is simple, as it has dispensed with all obsolete forms, such as imposing the majority's opinion on the minority. The central executive committee elects the rector, and whenever questions of a scientific or moral nature come up, the committee, after having it discussed, leaves the decision to the general secretary.

The present general secretary is Mr. De Jonge, the rector Mr. De Greef, the former, the moral, the latter, the intellectual pivot of the New University.

An interesting rule in the organization of the New University is: Make it easy for the students to become professors.

This effort of rejuvenation is of great importance, for it

guarantees that the exposition of facts and scientific doctrines shall not lose modernity and originality. Thus the New University obeys the anthropological law concerning the fecundity and originality of work thereby assuring favorable conditions for its own existence.

The present departments of the New University are as follows:

- I. Faculty of Social Sciences.
- II. Faculty of Law.
- III. Institute of Geography.
- IV. Institute of Fermentation.
- V. University Extension.

The University has been reduced to these four departments for it cannot give certificates of legal value. Now it is a University for those who want to know, and use their knowledge to a broader end,—and not for those who wish to study in order to secure a lucrative position.

By canceling professional education the dominating aim of the New University has received more attention: the aim to form men with character “to make something other than simple men of a certain profession, confined in the narrow horizon of a determined function” (Picard).

\* \* \*

The most important feature of this magnificent university is the Institute for Social Sciences.

In the University year 1905-1906 we find the material of the Institute of Social Sciences divided as follows:

#### I. SECTION.—MATHEMATICS AND MECHANICS.

1. Mathematics.
2. Mechanics.

#### II. SECTION.—PHYSICS AND CHEMISTRY.

1. Mineralogy.
2. Geology.
3. Organic Chemistry.
4. Biologic Chemistry.
5. The Modern Theories of Chemistry.
6. Medical Hydrology.

#### III. SECTION.—BIOLOGY AND PSYCHOLOGY.

1. Botany.
2. Biology.
3. Physiology.
4. Psycho-Physiology.
5. General Psychology.
6. Psychiatry.
7. Pedology.
8. The Contagious and Epidemic Diseases in the Twentieth Century.
9. Education.



10. The Role of Creative Imagination in the Philosophy of Plato.
11. Evolution.
12. The Impossibility of a World Theory.

#### IV. SECTION.—SOCIAL SCIENCES.

##### A.—Economics.

1. Economics.—General Courses.
2. Economics of the Credit System.
3. Evolution of the Economic Régime.
4. History of Economics: Institutions and Doctrines.
5. Science of Finances.
6. Statistics.
7. The Economic Expansion of the Different European Nations.

##### B.—Genesis.

1. The Family.
2. The Family.—Evolution of Institutions.

##### C.—Art and History of Art.

1. The Permanent Features in the Evolution of Art.
2. History of Latin Literature.
3. History of Greek Literature.
4. History of French Literature.
5. History of English Literature.
6. Russian Literature.
7. Scandinavian Literature.
8. The Great Intellectual and Social Currents in Italian Literature.
9. Cosmopolitan Features in Literature.
10. Industrial Arts.
11. History of Painting.
12. History of Sculpture and Architecture.
13. History of Music.

##### C.—Collective Psychology.

1. Collective Psychology.
2. Psychiatry.
3. Legal Psycho-Pathology.
4. Criminal Psychology.
5. Studies Concerning the Anthropology and Sociology of the Poor Classes.
6. History of Philosophy.
7. The Materialistic Conception of History and the Religious Question.
8. The Philosophical Movement in the Eighteenth Century.
9. Contemporary History of Philosophy.
10. Critical Exposition of the Christian Dogma.
11. The Russian Philosophy.

##### E.—Ethics.

1. Moral Philosophy.

##### F.—Law.

1. Evolution of the Institutions of Public Law.
2. Evolution of the Institutions of Private Law.
3. French Law:
  - a) The Family.
  - b) Property.
  - c) Contracts.
  - d) Loans.

- e) Successions.
- f) Municipal Institutions.
- g) The Duel.
- 4. Evolution of Local Statutes in England.
- 5. Compared Legislation:
  - a) The Institutions of Civil Law.
  - b) The Family.
- 6. Labor Legislation.
- 7. Evolution of the Not Punishing Tendencies. (Evolution de l'Impunité.)
- 8. Criminal Sociology.
- 9. The Revision of the "Code Civil."

#### G.—Politics.

- 1. History of Greece.
- 2. Political Institutions of Rome.
- 3. History of Belgium.
- 4. The Universal Peace.
- 5. History of Colonisation.
- 6. The Doctrines of the Political Parties.
- 7. Egyptology.
- 8. History of the Russian Political Institutions.
- 9. History of the Political Institutions of the U. S. A.
- 10. Contemporary Russia.

#### H.—Sociology.

- 1. Elementary Sociology.
- 2. General Sociology.
- 3. Historical and Methodological Introduction to Sociology.
- 4. Sociology:
  - a) Social Functions and Organs.
  - b) Social Static.
  - c) Social Dynamic.
- 5. The Sociology of Action.
- 6. Social Hygiene.
- 7. The Cosmic Environment and its Influence Upon the Individual, Upon the Ethnical and Social Groupes.
- 8. The Influence of Experimental Sciences on Social Hygiene and Economy.
- 9. Geography of Time and Space.
- 10. Comparative Hygiene.—Men and Climate.
- 11. The Hygiene of Houses and Workshops.
- 12. Pedology.—New Scientific Principles in the Education of Children.
- 13. Positive Methodology.
- 14. The Philosophical Basis of Socialism.
- 15. Integral Sociology.
- 16. Juridical Sociology.
- 17. Genetical Sociology.

#### Special Lecture Courses.

Industrial Evolution.  
 Farmer Question.  
 Labor Legislation.  
 Co-operation.  
 Unionism.  
 Municipal Politics and Economics.  
 State Exploitation.  
 The Roots of the Labor Movement.

The Institute of Social Sciences is the international rendez-vous of scientific men. Here they gather to freely express their thought before an international audience composed of intelligent workingmen, intellectual women, lawyers and artists, students of all nationalities and employees of the state. Here they come and enthusiastically co-operate in the work of the Belgian scientists, certain that their work will be directed to the elevation of youth and humanity.

We see side by side with the Belgian professors, whose names are well known in sciences or politics, such as G. de Greef, de Brouckère, Destrée, Huysmans, Bertrand, Janson, Kufferath, Picard, Vandervelde, and Van de Velde, such names as Elie and Elisée Reclus, (both of whom recently died), Ferri, Hamon, Tsiaieff, Kovalevsky, Lagardelle, Loria, Niceforo, Michels, Gumplovicz, Folkmar, Gide, Seignobos, Lombroso, Cosentini, Sighele, Leopold, Petrucci, and Forel and many others.

Many original lecture courses given in the New University as those by Ferri, Loria, Hamon, Niceforo, Vandervelde, Kovalevsky, Reclus, de Greef and others have been circulated in book form all over the world making many new converts.

The scientific and educational work of the New University has become, during the last years, of such international significance, that the great universities of England, France, Germany and other countries have been forced to recognize the full legal value of the years spent in the New University. Thus the foreign students may spend a year or two in Brussel's without losing the years required for examination in their home universities. This international recognition will greatly increase the prosperity of the New University and finally induce the authorities to reestablish the legality of the most important Belgian institution.

\* \* \*

I have given above the entire program for 1905-1906 of the Institute of Social Sciences for I am convinced of its importance. It is planned so as emphasize the vital connection which unites all particular sciences. It gives an all-embracing, synthetic and at the same time a speculative and practical view of the intellectual dominion, thus offering a broad, multilateral scientific education for those who wish to exercise a reflected social action or who desire to give themselves up to a rational study of one particular branch of human knowledge.

By accomplishing a large and broad scientific education it facilitates the efforts of the student to reach deepened knowledge.

While the dead and dry material of the old conventional universities decreases the energy of the student and discourages him—the courses of the New University by treating living issues or giving a living significance to the dead material enhances the student's energy to work.



The influence of science in all branches of human activity, from industrial production to the elaboration of laws and the political organization of society, is so strongly felt to-day,—that a comprehensive, rational and modern scientific education of our youth has become a problem of progress.

Modern, practical life has in many instances proved that to exercise successfully one's profession it is necessary to be versed not only in that particular profession—but that it is of imperative importance to know the different allied branches and to have a general conception of the role one's work is playing in the *ensemble* of social and economic life.

A professional man or a scientist when equipped with an extensive view of all social manifestations is more fit to enter intensively his special work and is more apt to accomplish his aim for he never will entertain a plan without practical importance or general interest.

The old universities never have given an ever-lasting ideal to the youth. Therefore they have missed the point. An ideal to struggle for is the backbone in one's life. In this ideal all deeds center. Going out therefrom and returning thereto when something is accomplished.

Yes, the universities put up an ideal. But, in the last analysis, it was always the ideal of money. Mammon was the God of the youth. And they still worship it.

The moral and intellectual insignificance and sterility of our universities can easily be traced back to the fact that they do not imbue the youth with a beautiful life-aim. The present youth is old. No ideal is moving them toward a large idea, no human conception directs them in their work. They go through the drudgery of the university years and then are fit for a profession. But they do not start in to work for an enlarged scope—for they never have been induced to look around and realize what has to be done to make life worth while. The present youth is old. Enervated. Without *élan*.

The universities are but tools in the hands of the ruling capitalistic classes who must have a human material that is obedient, without initiative and without originality. They have destroyed the flower of the youth so cherished during past ages.

Our university youth are sterile. All great works of art, literature and science come from self-made men or from those, who escaped the suffocating air of the universities. In fact, we see but a few capable young men of university education in the great social movements of human regeneration.

Those few young university women and men to whose struggle for radical thought is due the fresh intellectual wind which swept over the universities during these last years,—have not received their impetus from the university itself. They were

inspired—as said before—by the resurrection of the “lower classes.” The great intellectual life and the new forms of moral and economic solidarity which ripened within the struggle of the proletariat has drawn unto this struggle the best of the youth.

The struggle imbued them with a great ideal which threw light and joy into their work. The *élan* of the youth came back. It began its work. The youth has become once more the bearer of revolutionary ideals.

They threw away the corrupting pleasures of modern life; they shook off the prejudiced and utilitarian university conceptions. The youth has become once more the bearer of world-embracing humanistic ideals.

\* \* \*

The organizers of the New University have fully grasped the tremendous educational value of a great ideal. The whole teaching of the New University is focusing in one great standpoint: the betterment of social life and the elevation of the individual.

While the teaching of the various sciences give broad knowledge to the students—the ideal which they breath unifies and rounds the scientific material into one positive attitude toward life: to use knowledge for a social aim; for the benefit of all.

Such an education, in modern times, is perfectly new and original. Even if the New University had never enriched science with original scientific work its efforts to recall youth to its rightful place would ever be felt.

Indeed many students have left this splendid institution full of enkindling knowledge and social aims. Not only the youth of Belgium but also that of Russia, Rumania, China, Italy, England, Japan and of other countries, have been inspired and prepared for life in Brussels.

They try to prove their gratitude toward the university by diffusing their knowledge and ideal and by founding similar institutions.

The ideal the youth took with them was a talisman for life. It never ceased in its influence. It gave encouragement and proved a spur. It made their life a rich source of impulses and fruitful work. It made them happy by rendering them capable of loving a work done for others.

Ferri says: “This great work—the New University—merits the encouragement of all countries. It is in the name of the cosmopolitan science, it is in the name of the intellectual and moral elevation of life, it is for its tendency toward the most noble and most generous ideal of human fraternity that the efforts and the sacrifices of the New University claim the right to all the sympathies of advanced people.”

## Bibliography.

FERRI, ENRICO:

Une oeuvre internationale d'élévation humaine. Paris 1899.

PICARD, EDMOND:

Une nouvelle université a Bruxelles. Bruxelles 1894.

PICARD, EDMOND:

L'institut des Hautes Etudes a L'Université Nouvelle de Bruxelles. Paris 1897.

L'UNIVERSITE NOUVELLE, organc' de l'école libre d'enseignement supérieur et de l'Institut des Hautes Eludes de Bruxelles. 7th October 1904 — 19th October 1896.

UNIVERSITE NOUVELLE DE BRUXELLES.

Programmes des Cours. 1894-1906. Bruselles.

Bruxels, 1906.

ODON POR.

---

[As our readers already know, The Rand School of Social Science, which aims to do for American educational life what the New University has done for Belgian, has been established in New York, and will open for work this Fall. Those desiring further information, can address the secretary at 112 E. 19th Street, New York City. *Ed.*]



## German Labor Unions in the Year 1905.

THE statistics of the general committee of the German trade unions for the year 1905, which Comrade Legien has just published, show once more a striking picture of the economic activity of the German laborers, together with an almost unprecedented increase in membership. The continuously increasing ferocity of the Employers' Associations, who have sought to injure the labor organizations by general lock-outs, has opened the eyes of the hitherto indifferent masses, and shown them that their place in the organization by the side of the fighting comrades of their class. Meanwhile it will be a mistake to credit the success of the organization of the unions exclusively to the attacks of the Employers' Associations. This is certainly one of the causes which forces the masses of the workers into the labor union, but it is not the only cause of their increase. We must look further if we are to thoroughly establish these causes, and we shall discover that it is the institutions of the unions themselves and their activity from year to year, and especially their financial accomplishments, which have brought about this result. The more stable the economic institutions become the more they extend their organization even into the smallest places, and the more the financial systems of the unions are conducted on safe lines, the more they become a complete protection for the great mass of the workers. To be sure this carries with it a greater responsibility on the part of the unions; on the one side because their action is no longer confined to the immediate popular accomplishments; on the other side also because the tasks which they must take up in the struggle for the emancipation of the working class become ever greater and more pressing; and because also the difficulties increase of directing such great bodies in a uniform direction toward definite, clearly designated aims and objects. It is a small thing to fill a little body of a few thousand with a single idea and feeling, where an individual may exercise so great an intellectual influence. The case becomes much more difficult when millions are dealt with who are to be led in battle against a world of enemies. To be sure within these millions there is a common class feeling of opposition to the immediately comprehensible form of exploitation, or at least it can be easily awakened; but those delusive ideas which have been drunk in with the mother's

milk and then systematically fostered by the ruling classes and their institutions, in the church and school, are **not so** easily driven out of the masses over night. But the proletarian class-consciousness, the world view of the class-conscious proletariat, is, even if a common phenomenon in the mass, nevertheless something that the individual must first obtain. To help him to this end is the great educational task of the union, but it cannot prescribe beforehand how he shall believe, feel and think. The application of such tactics would, instead of attracting the workers to the union for the common battle, rather drive the greater portion, of them into armies of the antagonistic exploiters.

Our unions have never adopted such tactics. They have much rather taken as their motto the striking phrase of Lassalle: "The art of all practical success consists in concentrating all forces upon one point, which must be reached within a certain time in order to solve the expected task." They have accordingly directed their entire forces to the organization of the masses and to make these capable of enduring and fighting, wherever the capacity of fighting and enduring was an indispensable condition of organization. The statistics that Legien has just published show the results which have been gained by these methods during the year 1905.

The number of organized workers in Germany belonging to the central union was 1,429,303 at the close of the year 1905, that is, an increase over the close of the year 1904 of 316,084. The average membership during the year 1895 was 1,334,803, which is an increase of 292,695 members over the average membership of 1904. In the year 1900 the membership of the unions was 680,427. In the course of five years these numbers have doubled. This is the result of the work of agitation and organization of the union and of the industrial conflict.

But the women workers also are beginning to be more and more filled with the spirit of economic organization, although here things go somewhat slower. When we recall, however, that in the year 1905 only 22,884 working women were economically organized, then the increase of 51,567 women members in five years is still a very promising result and one which should spur on to greater activity in the work of agitation among working women. More and more do the organizations with women members begin to subscribe to the organ of the Stuttgart party publishing house, (*Gleichheit*), so that in this way the education concerning the political helplessness and political tasks of women is cared for. The exact extent of the circulation of "*Gleichheit*" among the women members of the organization has not been

previously given in the statistics of the union. It is, however somewhat between 20,000 and 30,000.

The development of the union press has gone hand in hand with the strengthening of the organization. The circulation in the year 1905 of all periodicals reached 1,550,450, as opposed to 816,420 in 1902; and of the 61 union organs: one appears three times a week, — 29 weekly, — 3 three times a month, — sixteen every two weeks, — six twice a month and six once a month. The total expense for the press reached 1,415,397 Marks. For agitation 1,305,132 Marks was expended in the year 1905, to which must also be added the almost equal sum which was expended for the organization of new unions, a work which is of enormous significance for agitation. There was an expenditure of 37,250 Marks for libraries. The educational division of the unions also expended exclusive of the periodicals 2,757,785 Marks. When we further remember that the greatest portion of the labor force for which the unions paid 456,856 Marks during the year 1905 is also devoted to this work of education, we can make a striking picture of the pioneer work of the German unions in the task of education and training of the workers for effective fighters in the cause of the proletariat. The "Christian" and "Hirsch Dunker" unions require very little attention. The latter have at last exhausted their effective strength among German workers, since they are no longer able by acting as strike-breakers and disruptionists, to prevent effective fighting for the betterment of the condition of the worker. They increased their membership only 5,208 last year and have had a membership of 117,097 for the year. The "Christians" to be sure had an increase of 80,550 but still remain with practically an insignificant membership of 188,106.

WILHELM JANSON in "*Neue Zeit*."

*Translated by A. M. Simons.*



## The Social Revolution.

WE ARE now at the central point of Revisionism, the point from which everything else in the theories of the Revisionists radiates and to which everything in their arguments gravitates. The *casus belli* which moves all their hosts, — the *Social Revolution*. The red flag of the social revolution is the red cloth the sight of which none of them can bear. Whatever their disagreements, and they are not few, they are all agreed that the social revolution *wouldn't*, *shouldn't* and *couldn't* come. Struve proves it philosophically, Tugan-Baranowsky proves it economico-mathematically, Oppenheimer proves it sociologically, Bernstein proves it by a composite method which cannot easily be classified, and the rest of them in any old way.

What is this social revolution which has thus aroused them? It is not, of course, the fact of the change from the capitalist to the socialist order. They all, or almost all, believe in that, in some form or other. It is the particular form or manner in which it is to come about, according to the Marxian teaching, to which they object. It is the implication of the suddenness of the change, and the violent manner in which it will be brought about as the culmination of a struggle, that arouses the opposition. The change could, should and would come in all imaginable ways, but none of them will be sudden or violent. For they are all violently opposed to violence. And not only physical violence, but any kind of violence or disturbance. Therefore, socialism will come, according to their notion, as a gradual enlargement or a gradual diminution of capitalism, but never as an overthrow, more or less sudden, more or less violent, physical, social or economic, as Marx imagined it.

Marx says that the "centralization of the means of production and socialization of labor at last reach a point where they become incompatible with their capitalist shell. This shell is *burst* asunder. The knell of capitalist private property sounds. The expropriators are expropriated." This, says Struve, is too sudden, and is philosophically quite impossible. There is no philosophic way in which the sudden transformation of one social order into another could be explained, no logical method by which it could be reasoned out. Hence it could not take place. "The continuity of every change, even the most radical, is a necessary cognito-theoretic and psychological postulate of its comprehension. The evolutionary principle takes a position analogous to the law of causation: it is a universally valid form in which we must picture to ourselves the radical changes of things in order to

comprehend them. Of the content and the casuality of the change the evolutionary principle tells us nothing: it only gives us its form, and this form is — continuity. The old maxim: *natura non facit saltus* should, accordingly, be changed into: *intellectus non potitur saltus*." All of which may or may not be true. We are not sufficiently concerned in the subject to undertake to decide that question here. For ourselves we hope it is not true, but if it be true, let the theories of cognition and psychology look out for themselves. The maxim: *natura non facit saltus*, in so far as it is still part of our scientific apparatus, simply means that nothing happens without any cause, but when there is sufficient cause therefore nature does leap. As a matter of fact sudden leaps are almost as frequent in nature as are slow changes, and the figure used by Marx, that of a bursting shell, may be considered its most common and most perfect example. Furthermore, it does not in any way interfere with the evolutionary principle, to which Struve does, in our opinion, great injustice by reducing in reality to mere *slowness*, for such violent leaps as the bursting of shells do not by any means interfere with the *continuity* of the process, as Struve seems to think. On the contrary these violent leaps are part of the revolutionary process and constitute its culmination point, as well as the starting point for a renewal of this process, in all higher forms of life. The natural sequence of events being such, a theory of cognition *must* be able to explain it to our comprehension, and to say that some theory which styles itself a theory of cognition cannot do that is simply another way of saying that it is not a theory of cognition.

Another "philosophical" objection which Struve advances is supposed to be based on the Materialistic Conception of History, which he feels himself called upon to protect against Marx. According to the Materialistic Conception of History, says he, it is impossible that the legal forms which make up the social system should become so entirely incompatible or antagonistic to the forms of production as to cause a breaking up of the whole system. For, that theory, properly understood, requires that the legal forms should continually adjust themselves to the material conditions, as they change, and it would be an infringement on the power of the economic forces to suppose that they should not change the legal forms as they go along. We shall not enter here into a long discussion to prove that Struve has not "properly understood" the Materialistic Conception of History. We will simply say that if Struve has understood it properly then the Materialistic Conception of History is sadly in the wrong. For the fact, of which there is abundant historical proof, is that legal forms become quite antagonistic and absolutely incompatible with economic conditions and that very serious and violent disturbances result therefrom. No amount of reverence for the "economic factor" can blind us to the sad truth, that that much-abused

worthy is not quite as all-powerful as some of his would-be admirers would have us believe, or, at any rate, that his influence is not quite as direct, and therefore does not work quite as smoothly, as they imagine. Besides, in his touching care for the Materialistic Conception of History, Struve has entirely forgotten the fact that, according to Marx, the economic conditions of the capitalist system are themselves a mass of contradictions, and could not therefore result in a smoothly working legal or political system.

It was evidently with the intention of eliminating some of the absurdities which the purely philosophic opponents of the Social Revolution had to resort to in their argument, that Rudolph Goldscheid constructed his theory of the so-called "Sociological Wave." This theory is quite cleverly constructed, and is evidently designed to present an argument against the possibility of the social revolution without the use of some of the grosser errors of his predecessors. This theory recognizes most of the Marxian premises, and therefore sounds plausible. It consists in this: The tendency of the accumulation of capital is, as Marx says, towards increasing the misery of the working-class. At the same time this accumulation has also the tendency to organize the working-class, as Marx has also clearly stated. This results in a struggle between organized labor and the capitalists, the class struggle on which Marx lays so much stress. In this struggle, the fortunes of war alternate, giving victory now to the one side and now to the other.

When the tendency of capitalistic accumulation has gone very far in reducing the condition of the working-class, this engenders the revolutionary feeling of the proletariat, who put up a strenuous fight until they gain a victory substantially bettering their condition, usually putting it on a higher plain than it ever was before. This better condition lasts for some time until the capitalists, driven to it by the lash of competition, turn on the screws and attempt to enforce the tendency of capitalistic accumulation and reduce the condition of the workingmen to their former level. In this they succeed only partly, for when the workingmen have reached a higher level of well-being they utilize it to strengthen their organization, obtain more knowledge, and intelligence, and the spirit of revolt is aroused in them long before the former low level of their estate is reached. Their resistance is intensified, and the fight on their part does not slacken until they reach not only the high level which they formerly occupied but until they make new conquests placing themselves on heights never yet before reached. This they are enabled to do because the spirit of revolt which is aroused in them by the pressure of economic tendencies succeeds in constantly *limiting and checking the economic process and diverting it from its natural course*. So that "the social evolution moves in a wave-like course,



which has this peculiarity: No matter what relation the hill and dale may have to each other, the crest of each succeeding wave reaches, as a rule, a higher level than any preceding one." The waves will finally run so high that their crests will reach into socialism: the prospect of a social revolution is successfully banished.

The whole thing sounds so plausible, the argument so much Marxian, and the picture of the rising waves is so beautiful, that one is almost tempted to overlook the fact that there is absolutely no warrant in the whole argument for the assumption so unceremoniously made that the spirit of revolt engendered in the working class by the hardships and misery of capitalistic accumulation succeeds in *constantly limiting and checking the economic process* while the capitalist system lasts. And yet it is on this assumption that the whole thing rests! With this assumption out, the whole argument against the social revolution as Marx conceived it, with bursting of shell and all, falls to the ground. We are not disposed to quarrel with the author of the "sociological wave" in so far as the same does not put forward any higher pretensions than to give us a description of the bettering of the condition of the working-class under capitalism in so far as the same is possible under the laws governing capitalist production and accumulation. That is to say in so far as it affects the question of the *impoverishment* of the working-class. And in so far it does not in any way contradict the Marxian theory. It is quite different, however, when it comes to the abolition or limiting of the economic laws by "psychological tendencies" in the peaceful movement of the "sociological wave." Before we can accept his statements we must carefully examine into the question whether the tendencies of modern development do or do not *limit* the laws of capitalist production and accumulation, and if they do whether such *limitations* can abolish the whole capitalist system by degrees and transform it into a socialist system without the bursting of any shells. This brings us back to the purely economic question of the possibilities of capitalistic development, and the theories of the "expansion," "adaptation" and "adjustment" of capitalism brought forward by the Revisionists.

In the March issue of this REVIEW we discussed at length the economic contradictions of the capitalist system. We concluded our examination with the statement that the great problem of capitalist economics is the disposition of the surplus-product created continually under that system. It is the inability to dispose of that product that is the chief cause of the temporary disturbances within its bowels, and which will lead to its final breakdown and replacement by the socialist mode of production and distribution.

The Revisionists with Bernstein at their head question the correctness of these conclusions, both as regards the crises with-

in the capitalist system and its ultimate breakdown. Bernstein has nothing definite to say as to the cause of economic crises in the capitalist system, except to inform us that much could be said and has been said on either side, and that people who are interested in analogies might find very interesting analogies between the theories on this subject and some other interesting subject. As to the Marxian theory of crises Bernstein has again nothing more definite or instructive to say except that Marx, as usual, contradicts himself in the most flagrant manner, and that the explanation of this contradiction is to be found again as usual, in the fact that, as is very usual, and, indeed, unavoidable, some time has elapsed between the writing of the contradictory passages. The only unusual thing about this very enlightening information is the correct statement that the passage contained in the earlier volumes was written much later than that contained in the third volume; a statement which must confound his friends who have been writing very learned disquisitions on the *development* of the Marxian theory, based on the contradictions between the earlier and later volumes of *Capital*, which were to be explained by the fact that the *third* volume was the fruit of Marx's *later* and *riper* judgment. As to the subject-matter itself the reader is left absolutely in the dark as to what either the Marxian or the Bernsteinian theory of crises (if there be such) may be. It is very evident, however, from what he does say that he is himself very much in the dark on the subject. This does not prevent him, however, any more than a similar groping in the dark prevents his friends, from giving instruction on the subject, and from *revising* a theory which they do not understand.

The sum and substance of the argument against the Marxian conception of the tendencies of capitalistic economic development put forward by Revisionism, amount to this: The contradictions observed by Marx are not inherent in capitalism, as Marx supposed, but are merely connected with and are the result of a certain *form* of capitalism, to wit: capitalism in its early stages when private enterprise with its resultant anarchy of production was predominant. As soon, however, as the anarchy will be eliminated from capitalistic production, and that anarchy will be eliminated by the organization and systematization of production through the modern trusts and other industrial combinations, crises will be abolished, particularly in view of the apparently boundless possibilities of the *expansion* of capitalist markets by the aid of modern imperialism; and as the final breakdown of capitalism, or social revolution, is nothing more than a big crisis, the possible danger of a revolution is averted, the moment the cause of crises is removed. The basis of fact for this argument is furnished by the circumstance that the law of the periodical recurrence of economic crises insisted on by Marx was apparently broken through by the modern trusts with the aid of Imperialism,

and the crisis which was due at about the beginning of this Century successfully kept out by them.

Before proceeding any further we shall have to examine the Marxian theory of crises, and the connection in which crises *within* the capitalist system stand to the ultimate breakdown of the system as a whole, and then examine the facts of the latest developments of capitalism as to their bearings on each.

According to Marx there are two distinct causes of crises: One is the separation of the act of exchange of commodities into two separate acts, the exchange of commodity A for money and then the exchange of that money for commodity B, by the introduction of money as the universal commodity and general repository of exchange-value. By dividing the act of exchange into two separate and independent acts, disconnected in point of time, the *possibility* of crises is given. For, should the interval between the two acts be too long the wheels of production will stop, the market will become overloaded with goods, and a crisis will result. This possibility turns into a probability because of the peculiar character of money as the universal commodity and special repository of exchange-value which makes it a very much coveted good, as it is only in that form that value is realized and remains real. Of course, capital is anxious to fulfil its function, the creation of surplus-value, and in its anxiety to create surplus-value it takes the risk of having the value crystallized in itself transformed into such form where the value realized in it may again be called into question and be partly lost. But with all that capital is essentially cowardly, and the least disturbance frightens it and makes it withdraw into its shell. And a disturbance arises each time there is a disproportion of production, which is a common occurrence under our system of private production and competition. This probability, again, is intensified by our credit system, which on the one hand makes capital extremely sensitive to disturbances and increases its natural cowardice, and on the other opens up great vistas of gain by speculation and jobbery through panics and crises.

Such crises, that is crises chargeable to the circulation process of commodities, are of course due to the "anarchy of production," and will disappear with the disappearance of that anarchy, assuming that the latter may disappear while the capitalist system lasts. Assuming therefore that the trusts and industrial combinations can abolish this anarchy and regulate production, the Revisionists are quite right in asserting that no commercial crisis will occur again on that account. Their mistake lies in assuming that the "anarchy of production" is, according to Marx, the only cause of commercial crisis. As a matter of fact the cause mentioned by us above is not only not the *only* but not even the *chief* cause of crises according to Marx. This could be determined as a mere matter of logic, that method of determining econ-



omic and sociological questions which is so dear to the heart of some Revisionists. For, the "anarchy of production," in its very nature and essence an irregular factor, could not possibly be the cause of *regularly recurring* crises. But Marx does not leave any room for doubt as to what is, in his opinion, the chief cause of crises under capitalism.

This cause is the inherent contradiction of that system which was already pointed out before, the dual position of the laborer as a seller of his labor-power and a purchaser of the products of this labor-power, and the creation of a surplus-product flowing therefrom which must result in an over-production of commodities quite apart from the "anarchy of production." It is to this *constant* factor, the constantly accumulating surplus-product, that the *constancy* with which crises recur is due. It is to this that the *industrial cycle*, the periodical recurrence of prosperity and stagnation, is due. And this recurrence of prosperity and stagnation, that is to say, the inability to *continually* carry on production on that plane which the productive forces of society *permit and require*, is the foundation of the Marxian theory of crises. The fact, therefore, pointed to by Revisionists, that, as Tugan-Baranowsky has shown in his History of Commercial Crises in England, the *cycle* has now assumed another form, that instead of feverish activity preparing the way for a sudden crash there is now a gradual tide and ebb of prosperity and stagnation, is not a refutation of Marx but a confirmation of the correctness of his analysis of capitalistic production. This fact, which is ascribed to the regulative influence of the modern trusts and combinations, proves conclusively that neither trusts and combinations nor any other regulative influence can abolish crises, because it cannot abolish the chief cause of crises — overproduction, which does not depend on the lack of regulation of production but is inherent in the capitalistic mode of production. Trusts and combinations, if they can do anything at all, can only affect the form which the crises may assume, whether they should be short and acute as formerly or mild and long-drawn-out as now, but no more. This is acknowledged even by Tugan-Baranowsky himself.

Some Marx-critics seem to derive some comfort from the fact that, owing to the regulative influence of modern industrial combinations, crises have ceased to be as acute as formerly. We fail to see wherein a long period of stagnation is any better than an acute crises. That is, from the workingman's point of view. As Tugan-Baranowsky himself points out the change in the character of the industrial cycle has benefited the capitalist class, and the position of the workingclass has become much worse for it.

Of course the chief reason for their exultation over this change, or at least that of some of them, is their belief that the

doing away with the acuteness of crises does away with the possibility of the occurrence of the great and final crises, the social revolution, which they cannot imagine otherwise than as a sudden crash. But this cataclysmic conception of the breakdown of capitalism is not part of the Marxian theory, and has, at any rate, nothing to do with his theory of crises. The disappearance of the acuteness of commercial crises does not in any way affect their revolutionary influence, if their influence be necessary for the coming of the social revolution. For the remedy is worse than the disease as far as its influence on the condition of the workingclass is concerned, except, of course, to the mind of those who imagine the great revolution as the work of a hungry and desperate mob driven to distraction and destruction by the immediate lack of work, food and shelter. The mildness of the change from one phase of the industrial cycle to the other does not lessen the mass of misery produced by it, nor does it indicate any lessening of the contradictions of the capitalist system of production; it does not therefore affect the probabilities of a social revolution, except if we imagine it as a sudden cessation of all economic activity. The real question therefore is, not whether crises have become less acute in form but whether the economic contradictions which produce them have lost any of their acuteness. This brings us to the question of the *adaptability* and *expansiveness* of the capitalist system of production.

That capitalism has obtained a new lease of life by embarking on the sea of Imperialism is assured by the Revisionists although none of them ever attempted to carefully examine into the question in order to ascertain whether there was any basis of fact for such assumption, and if the assumption was correct how long such new lease would last. Bernstein declines at the decisive moment to commit himself. True to his nihilistic-opportunistic instinct he leaves the question an open one, which does not, however, prevent him and his friends from holding language as if they had squarely met the issue and settled it.

A careful examination of the question will show, however, that, both as a matter of abstract reasoning and as a matter of concrete fact, Imperialism cannot save the capitalist system, although it undoubtedly may prolong its existence. If the Marxian analysis of the capitalist system of production is correct, and that system does suffer with the inherent malady of ever increasing overproduction because of the ever increasing diminution of the share of the workingman in the product of his labor, then it follows as a logical conclusion that the mere *extension* of that system to new fields cannot save it, for the system would then carry with it its fatal malady to these new fields. And it is to a mere *extension of the capitalist system* that Imperialism reduces itself in the last analysis. For it must be remembered that capi-

talism cannot open a new market for its products without making the new territory part of its own system of production. It is the curse of capitalism that by the very processes with which it creates its new customers for its goods it makes of them competitors in the business of producing these goods. Therein lies the difference between the old and the new forms of colonization. That is why colonial dependencies, colonial empires in the old sense of the word, are no longer possible, except as a temporary and passing stage. Of course while this stage lasts it is of some relief to the *mother* country suffering from being *heavy* with surplus-product. But the infant colonies grow very rapidly, and with the ripening age of capitalism its offspring develop marvelous precociousness, and soon serve only to "extend" the seriousness of the situation.

The facts verify this reasoning. But before examining the facts we must again pay our respects to that bright light of anti-Marxian economic literature whom we have already had occasion to mention before — Prof. Tugan-Baranowsky. With that insight of the true scholar which so favorably distinguishes him from the rest of the Revisionist host he saw that the Marxian theory cannot be overthrown by such indefinite and meaningless talk as that of "adaption," "extension," or "expansion." That the Marxian theoretical edifice is too solidly built and is too finished a structure to be vulnerable to such mode of attack. That it can be successfully attacked, if at all, only at its foundation and only by using the methods employed in its construction. He therefore attempts to show by an analysis of capitalistic production that the Marxian conclusion of a necessary overproduction does not follow. The result of his efforts is a theory of "distribution" of production, according to which if production is "regulated" in such a way as to always produce a certain, ever increasing, share of the total yearly product in the form of "means of production," then no over-production will ever occur. I have somewhere else shown that this theory is an utter absurdity. But nevertheless it cannot be denied that this theory is the only scholarly attempt on the part of any Revisionist to disprove the Marxian theory of crises and over-production. That he failed in his attempt was not his fault but his fate. And the fact that the theory so laboriously constructed by him is sheer nonsense makes his fate the more tragical. For Tugan-Baranowsky is not only an acute theoretician but also a keen observer of the facts of life. But, as I have stated somewhere else, he suffers with the malady of his age: a sickly yearning for the "ethical" and a hysterical hunt for the "practical." The yearning for the "ethical" drove him away from the "unethical" Marxian system, and, left to drift without the sure guidance of an all-embracing theory, he clings to the isolated facts of existence which obtrude themselves upon his keen vision.



The facts upon which Tugan-Baranowsky constructs his theory are the same facts to which we alluded above as confirming our theory. They are: that the area of capitalism expands, and that production, in so far as the goods produced are concerned, has so changed that the principal goods produced now by the leading capitalist countries are machinery and other "means of production," instead of consumable goods as was formerly the case. From these two facts Tugan-Baranowsky concludes that it is a law of capitalistic development that the quota of consumable goods in the yearly product of society should constantly grow smaller and the quota of "means of production" as constantly increase; and that if the proper proportion is always observed no over-production can ever occur. Is this conclusion correct? Most emphatically, no! Tugan-Baranowsky sees the immense masses of "means of production" produced annually by the leading capitalist countries, and he stands in awe of this great *fact*. A little less respect for "fact" and a little more respect for theory would have made him ask for the why and the wherefore. It would also have made him look for the connection between this fact and other facts. And first of all he would have taken notice of what was being done with these "means of production." Had he done so he would have observed that these immense masses of "means of production," with some exceptions which will be noted later, *are not used in the capitalistic countries in which they are produced*. They are produced in the capitalistic countries and *exported* into countries which are only in the process of *capitalization*, so to speak. He would then have understood that the surplus-product in capitalistic countries has so far not clogged the wheels of production (with certain exceptions to be noted later), not because of the clever distribution of production into the different spheres, not because of the change from the production of consumable goods to the production of "means of production," but because the capitalistic countries have so far, owing to the fact that some have developed capitalistically earlier than others, and there still remain capitalistically undeveloped countries, had an outside world into which they could dump the products which they could not absorb themselves, whether those products be cotton or iron goods. This does not, by any means, mean that the change from cotton to iron goods, as the leading product of the foremost capitalistic countries is of no significance. On the contrary, it is of the greatest importance. But its significance is entirely different from that ascribed to it by Tugan-Baranowsky. It shows the beginning of the end of capitalism. As long as the capitalist countries exported goods for consumption there was hope for capitalism, within those countries. There was no telling, then, how great the capacity of the non-capitalistic outside world for the consumption of capitalistically produced goods would be, nor how long it would last. The growth of machinery in the

export from the foremost capitalistic countries at the expense of consumption-goods shows that spheres which were formerly outside of capitalism, and therefore served as a dumping-ground for its surplus-product, are drawn into the world of capitalism. That as their own capitalism develops they produce their own consumption-goods. Now that they are in the initial stages of their capitalistic development, they need the capitalistically produced machinery. But soon they will not need this either. They will produce their own iron-goods just as they now produce their own cotton or other consumption-goods. Then they will not only cease to be a receptacle for the surplus-product of the now only capitalistic countries, but they will produce a surplus product of their own which they will find it hard to dispose of.

There are other things which Tugan-Baranowsky might have observed had his vision not been obstructed by the details of capitalistic practice. Things, the observation of which would have given him a glimpse of the "true inwardness" of the latest phase of capitalistic development. He would have noticed, for instance, that a tremendous amount of the "means of production" which are produced in capitalistic countries and are not directly exported, is used within those countries in such a manner; that is, in effect, equal to export. Such are the building of trans-continental railroads, interoceanic canals, and steamship lines designed to serve as an incident to the export of products from capitalism into the non-capitalistic or half-capitalistic world. Furthermore, in so far even as such "public improvements" are used wholly within the limits of capitalism (and a tremendous amount of the "means of production" is used for such purposes), they have the peculiar effect of removing large quantities of surplus-product from the market, at least temporarily. It is the peculiar nature of such means of production that their usefulness or uselessness can not be definitely ascertained until fully completed and operated for some time. The result is that immense masses of such "means of production" are constantly produced without any actual necessity therefor, and often for purely speculative purposes. While these "means of production" are being produced, and it takes years to complete them, the wheels of capitalistic production revolve merrily, without hitch or stop, notwithstanding the fact that the work may be absolutely useless in whole or in part, and that the value supposed to be created in their production, or at least a large part thereof, will never be realized. The wisecracks of capitalism, like Tugan-Baranowsky, listen to the siren-song of these merrily revolving wheels, and draw in their imagination alluring pictures of the endlessness of capitalism wound around an endless chain of "means of production." Of course, there is bound to come a rude awakening. The production of these particular "means of production" turns out to be the merest waste. But that is another story .....

In order to appreciate the importance of this point, (and this point applies equally to "means of production" of this nature, whether used within the limits of capitalism, or exported for use outside of it), we need only refer to Tugan-Baranowsky's own "History of Crises in England." The facts brought together in that book, in so far as they relate to the latest phase of capitalism, that are now under consideration, teach a remarkable lesson. This lesson can not be missed by one who contemplates the whole picture there represented, but could not be learned by Tugan-Baranowsky who saw only the details of the process by him described. His theory of the "distribution of production" is the result of his having missed the great lesson which that book teaches, and that is, that THE CAPITALIST SYSTEM LIVES AND THRIVES BY WASTE.

In speaking of the first "modern" crisis, that of 1857, Tugan-Baranowsky says in his History of Crises: — "The peculiarities of the crisis of 1857 find their explanation in the world-character of that crisis . . . . . The characteristic difference between the crisis of 1857 and those of 1825 and 1836 consisted also in the fact that this crisis fell most heavily not on the *cotton* industry as the former ones but on the *iron* industry. In this the new feature of the capitalistic mode of production found its expression, the increased importance of the part played by means of production on the world-market as well as in economic life generally. The stagnation of trade usually moves the industrialists to look for new markets for the disposition of their goods. In this respect the crisis of 1857 had a very strong effect. The exports from England to the United States fell from nineteen million pounds sterling (1857) to fourteen millions (1858); the exports from England to the East Indies, on the other hand, rose from 11.7 millions pounds (1857) to 16.8 millions pounds (1858). In order to recuperate from the blows which it received on the European and American markets English capital migrated to Asia. In the East Indies began an epoch of railroad building and of the improvement of inland ways of communication, which had the effect of increasing there the demand for English goods."

We can not repeat here the detailed statement of the crises that followed that of 1857 until the present day, but a careful examination of this very interesting part of Tugan-Baranowsky's book will prove very instructive. Briefly stated, all these crises were brought about by over-production of "means of production," particularly of the most lasting and staple means of production, those which it takes longest to produce, means of communication and public improvements. The typical crisis occurs in about the following manner:

The starting-point is the preceding crisis. As Tugan-Baranowsky says in the passage just quoted: "The stagnation of trade usually moves the industrialists to look for new markets

for the disposition of their goods." And as he has also observed, these goods consist mostly of means of production. In other words: after a crisis there is a superabundance of capital which is seeking employment. As the ordinary fields of occupation, particularly at home, are well filled, the capitalists look for some new fields wherein their capital could be profitably employed. Knowing that it would be useless to manufacture some new consumption-goods, or some machine for the purpose of manufacturing such goods, for the reason that the capacity of our society for consumption is limited, they start out to create new demands by creating new civilization. Civilization has proved a good customer, and capitalists turn to it instinctively whenever hard pressed. So the iron threads of civilization begin spinning at home and abroad, but mostly abroad, the missionary spirit of capitalism being well known. This creates a demand for vast amounts of capital and labor. Things begin to hum, — the prospects are bright. The markets are relieved of the surplus-product which clogged the wheels of production, and trade has revived. An era of prosperity has set in. The more crazy the "civilizing" undertaking, particularly the longer it takes to finish it, and obtain results, the greater the prosperity and the longer it lasts. But the undertaking has to be finished some day, and the harvest must at last be gathered in. Then it is discovered that the undertaking was a failure. The railroads, it turns out, were not necessary where they were built, for they have nothing to carry when they are ready for business. The undertaking goes into liquidation. The vast amounts of capital, the glorious piles or stretches of means of production now represent so much waste, for capital which does not pay dividends is not capital according to capitalistic laws. Then the crisis is on — things go to smash all around. The crisis is not limited to those interested in the particular undertaking. First, because the ramifications of modern capitalistic undertakings are so extensive and complicated, particularly by reason of our credit system, that no serious break can occur anywhere but that the whole system will crumble to its foundations. Secondly, because the large number of men employed in producing the defunct "means of production" are now thrown out of employment, thereby weighing heavily on the labor-market and demanding charity from their masters. And thirdly, because the apparent prosperity incident to the continued production of the large "means of production," has caused a general rush of production to an unwarranted extent, even in spheres which are not in any way directly connected with the particular undertaking which brought about the prosperity . . . . . and the crisis.

The deductions which Tugan-Baranowsky, himself, makes from these facts are very curious and furnish a good object lesson in the mental pathology of our age. We can not, however, pursue this branch of the discussion here any further. We hope to re-



sume this very interesting discussion some other time. For the present we will try to make some deductions on our own account, as far as they may be pertinent to our subject proper. The first irrefutable deduction which presents itself to our mind, not only from the facts adduced by Tugan-Baranowsky, but also from his own statement, is, that his theory, the perpetuation of capitalism by means of the proper "distribution" of production is the veriest rot. Prior to 1857 a change occurred in the "distribution" of the production of the chief seat of capitalism in those days, England. The production of cotton goods (consumption goods), was relegated to the background, and the front rank was assigned to iron-goods, (means of production). In other words, Tugan-Baranowsky's advice of how to prevent a crisis because of over-production was followed. But the crisis of 1857 *did come*, notwithstanding the use of this patent remedy. The faith of the capitalists in his remedy was evidently shaken a bit. For, as he has told us, the capitalists, instead of continuing the production of their means of production for the same market, which, according to Tugan-Baranowsky's theory, can never be over-stocked with means of production, they set about looking for NEW MARKETS. The only thing in which they followed him still was the "distribution" of production: they still produced means of production by preference. But the crises still continued to set in regularly, driving the poor capitalists to distraction in their vain hunt for new markets. In other words, THE NEW MARKETS WERE ALSO SOON OVER-STOCKED WITH MEANS OF PRODUCTION. And very naturally so: for means of production, (and this includes means of communication), are nothing more than MEANS to the production of consumable goods. Where, therefore, there is no demand for the consumable goods ultimately to be produced by their means, their production is over-production, and is so found to be when the ultimate test is applied. The capitalists discovered this much sooner than did Tugan-Baranowsky, owing to their healthy wolf-instinct of capitalism which can not be fed on fairy-tales, but requires good dividends to appease its hunger. Seeing that they are at the end of their tether, that the reserve of markets is giving out, while those under exploitation are getting hopelessly over-stocked, they set about fighting each other like wild cats in a scramble to get, each for himself, as much as possible of what is left. Capitalism reversed its time-honored policy of free-trade, and the era of wild imperialism in which we live has set in.

Modern crises and modern imperialism are very instructive studies. As Marx said, crises are mere SYMPTOMS of the contradictions working within the bowels of capitalism and a means of RELIEVING the diseased condition when it becomes acute. They are not the malady, itself, they merely show the presence of the malady. So does imperialism. As a matter of fact, modern crises and modern imperialism are manifestations of the same condition,

and are merely two phases of the same process. Among other things, they show how the capitalist system is kept alive by waste.

The waste of the capitalist system is of two kinds, ordinary and extraordinary. The ordinary waste is the most important because the more extensive; it is, however, the extraordinary waste that permits us to get a glimpse into the vital forces of capitalism, and is, therefore, of greatest interest to us. It is this extraordinary waste that manifests itself in crises and in imperialism. We have already stated how imperialism has been heralded as the saviour of capitalism from crises and ultimate destruction for its surplus-product by providing new markets. It was pointed out that the great crisis which was scheduled for the beginning of this century did not come in, and this is claimed to be due to the opening up of new markets by the imperialistic policy of the modern capitalistic nations. In a way, this is true; the effect of a crisis being the destruction of the surplus-product which can not be absorbed by the social organism, and the permission of the resumption of normal production by removing the surplus-product from the market, anything that will serve the same purpose may, for the time being, take the place of a crisis. A great war, for instance, may have the same effect. It has usually been assumed that wars bring about crises. While it is true that under peculiar circumstances, particularly because of credit relations, the declaration of a war may hasten on an impending crisis, or even bring a financial one about, the usual and general effect of a war is just the reverse. A great war usually keeps a crisis out, for the reason that economically it has the same effect as a crisis and can take its place. After a great war an era of prosperity usually sets in, for the same reason that great prosperity usually follows a great crisis. The longer the war, the greater the destruction of property, both actual and potential, the greater the prosperity that will follow it.

A policy of imperialism, aside from the actual wars which it may lead to, has the same effects, and that is why it is beneficial to capitalism. Among the economic causes of the great popularity of imperialism must not only be counted the desire for new markets and their actual attainment, but the economic causes of the policy of hunting for new markets itself. We will illustrate this by an example. During the last presidential campaign in the United States the anti-imperialists made very much of certain statistics compiled by the late Edward Atkinson, showing that the expense to the United States in keeping and governing the Philippines was greater than what the whole trade of the United States with those islands amounted to. The anti-imperialists argued that it was the height of folly to pay more than a dollar for the opportunity of selling a dollar's worth of goods. From their own shop-keeper's point of view that is undoubtedly true. Not so from the standpoint of the modern, means-of-pro-

duction-producing capitalism. There arise times when goods must be gotten rid of at any expense. As these goods consist of means of production they can not be given in charity to the workmen nor destroyed bodily the way the western and southern farmers and planters destroy part of their crops, when they are too plentiful, in order to keep up the prices. These goods being capital, can only be gotten rid of by being sold or "invested." Hence this apparent craze for new markets. But this is not all. As far as the safety of the capitalistic system is concerned, in so far as it affects the "general prosperity of the country," as it is euphoniously styled, the millions expended in the effort to sell goods to the Philippines is not waste but gain. These millions represent so many millions worth of goods sold by the capitalists of the United States for unproductive consumption by military and civil employes and officials, a very effective though not always profitable way of disposing of a surplus-product which threatens to clog the wheels of business. It is true that this is sheer waste. But it is on waste that the capitalist system now depends for the continuance of its existence.

In this connection it must be added that it is not only the monies so expended directly that are wasted in that manner and for that purpose, or at least with that effect. To the direct expenses of colonies must be added the general military and naval establishments of modern nations, which are necessitated by this imperialistic policy. Every dollar expended in the military and naval "needs" of a country are the purest waste, but it is at the same time absolutely necessary for the preservation of the capitalistic system. Furthermore, it is not only the money expended on these "needs," and included in the official budgets, that must be taken into consideration. The big military and naval establishments require men, besides money. These men are taken away from ordinary production where they would compete with other men in the labor-market, and where the products by them produced would swell the masses of surplus-product to be disposed of in far-away lands. The taking away of a man for military or naval purposes, (including administrative duties of all sorts), relieves the labor-market by one man, and at the same time creates a demand for the goods to be consumed by him which are to be produced by those remaining at work at some useful occupation. Hence our continued prosperity. WASTE is the safety-valve of capitalism.

How long will this last? Evidently not forever. If the surplus-product can only be gotten rid of by waste, and by the kind of waste described above, and if the surplus-product which must be disposed of by such waste is always increasing we will evidently reach a stage when it will be physically impossible to dispose of it. By saying "physically" take of course, into consideration human nature, which is part of the "physics" of our

social system. There is however, no warrant for assuming that according to Marx capitalism would have to go on until such a physical catastrophe should occur. This theory of a final catastrophe which has been much exploited by Marx-critics is the result of their woeful ignorance of the Marxian philosophy and the connection it has with his economics. Even Tugan-Baranowsky says that in order that the transformation from capitalism to socialism should follow as an economic necessity, according to the Marxian philosophy, the *impossibility of the continuance of production under capitalism indefinitely* must be proven. That is why he exerts himself so much to prove that an absolute impossibility does not follow from an analysis of capitalistic production. But this assumption is entirely wrong. The Marxian philosophy does not require the arrival at an economic impossibility. This is a figment of the imagination of those who understand under the Materialistic Conception of History a Mechanical Conception of History.

Such is not the Marxian philosophy. It will be remembered that in describing the causes for social revolution generally, in outlining his philosophy of history, he says that a revolution occurs whenever the superstructure of laws, etc., turns from a means of helping production into *fetters* of production. He does not say that production under the old system must become *impossible* before a revolution sets in, but it is according to his theory sufficient that it becomes "fettered." And in speaking of the particular revolution now under discussion, that from capitalism to socialism, he says that the "knell of capitalist private property sounds" when "the monopoly of capital becomes a *fetter* upon the mode of production, which has sprung up and flourished along with it, and under it." When, "centralization of the means of production and socialization of labor at last reach a point where they become *incompatible* with their capitalist integument." According to the Marxian philosophy a system of production can only last as long as it helps, or at least does not hinder, the unfolding and full exploitation of the productive forces of society, and must give way to another system when it becomes a hindrance, a *fetter*, to production. That a system has become a hindrance and a *fetter* to production when it has reached the point, when it can only exist by preventing production, and by *wasting* what it has already produced goes without saying. Such system cannot therefore last very long, quite irrespective of the purely mechanical possibility or impossibility of its continuance. Such a system has become *historically impossible*, even though mechanically it may still be possible. As we have seen, *the capitalist system has reached that point: The capitalist system must go.*

L. B. BOUDIN.

(To be Continued.)



# EDITORIAL

## Socialism in the Present Campaign.

The "conspiracy of silence" is broken, smashed, exploded, scattered to the four winds. Two years ago we were in the midst of a presidential campaign. We were straining every nerve to make what we then considered an epoch-making, record-breaking campaign. It was all of that; all socialist campaigns are. That is the beauty of being a growing party; a movement that moves, breaks its record every time it enters the race.

Nevertheless we could not make the enemy admit we were in the field. Neither of the two old duplicate parties publicly recognized us, although they could not deny we were making them a lot of trouble. Now, what a difference! Shaw and Bonaparte, sent out "to give the key note" of the campaign, spend a large portion of their time warning against the "dangers," "fallacies," "delusions," etc., of socialism. To be sure they carefully avoid any real discussion of socialism, lest they thereby expose their own ignorance or direct their followers toward the source of knowledge. Bryan and Hearst are pinning placards all over themselves warning all who chance to look that way that they are not socialists. If they wish a certificate to that effect by a body of experts, the socialists will be glad to furnish it. Almost any socialist will willingly testify not only to their entire purity of the socialist taint, but also to their complete ignorance of the whole subject and to the spotless blackness of their capitalist character.

The current magazines reflect this change in an even more startling manner. In 1904 perhaps one-half dozen articles dealing with socialism were published in the leading magazines during the entire campaign. An examination of nearly a hundred of the latest issues of these publications showed nearly one-fourth of their space devoted to articles on socialism and about the socialist movement, exposing the aforesaid socialist "fallacies," "dangers," etc.; or at least tinged with what is popularly called a "socialistic" taint. If we should add to this the non-socialist literary publications written by prominent socialist writers, it would add almost another twenty-five per cent, so completely has the philosophy of socialism captured the literary workers of America.

It has been quite a favorite pastime of many of these writers on so

cialism to try to account for the increase in socialist sentiment. "Muck-rakers," insurance scandals, Idaho-Colorado outrages are a few of the more common explanations. Why not put them all together and add the rest and sum the whole thing up as capitalism?

Naturally this excitement or interest has aided in the increase of direct socialist party activity. It is no surprise, therefore, to learn that there are several districts in which the prospect of electing a socialist congressman is good. The East Side in New York is talking of sending Comrade Hillquit to Washington to represent the suffering workers in that district. The Pennsylvania coal miners have at least one candidate that they expect to see in Congress next winter. The Chicago stock yards workers have more than a fighting chance of electing a congressman.

Down in Joe Cannon's district the only enemy in opposition to the speaker that stands a chance is John Walker, vice-president of the United Mine Workers of America. Incidentally this puts Gompers in a difficult situation. When he first started gunning for the enemies of labor he promised that the first scalp he would bring home would be that of Uncle Joe. Gompers repeatedly declared his intention to stump the Danville district in order to "punish the enemy." That was before he heard he would need to back a *bona fide* labor ticket. The little Napoleon never imagined that he would have to decide anything more than which of two capitalists the laborers should love. The nomination of Walker seemed to cool Gompers' fierce desire to get revenge on Cannon. He could not very well refuse his endorsement to a man whose service in the cause of unionism was as long and far more faithful than his own and who undoubtedly had the support of the organized workers of his and who was a national officer of the largest union in the A. F. of L., district. But in Gompers' eyes he still lacked one qualification to render him a "true friend of labor;" he had never sat at Civic Federation scab banquets or preached the common interests of exploiter and exploited. Just how Gompers will escape from this dilemma is none of our troubles. He either will have to make a complete break with capitalism in this one instance or else admit that the bond that ties him to the employer is too strong for him to break. We await the outcome with interest.

In Wisconsin also there are a couple of districts from which a socialist congressman is more than a possibility. This state is also quite certain to increase its already large representation in the state legislature. Illinois will probably send some others to keep company with the two present members of the legislature. There are several other states in whose legislative bodies we may expect to see socialist workers during this coming year.

In Colorado there is much talk of electing Comrade Haywood as governor. While this does not seem to be anywhere within the bounds of possibility, since the socialist strength seems to be almost exclusively confined to Denver and a few mining camps, yet the fight which is being put up is serving to attract attention and to educate the workers as never

before. Throughout the South candidates are being put up where none has been nominated before.

So on the whole there is promise of a substantial increase in the socialist vote at the coming election.

\* \* \*

Just before the convention of the Industrial Workers of the World last June we published an article in this REVIEW pointing out the character of the Socialist Labor Party's friendship for the I. W. W. and the results of any affiliation with a De Leon ruled organization. At that time and since we have been subject to torrents of abusive language as disrupters, enemies of the I. W. W., traitors, etc. Today every word of that article has been justified. The recent convention of the I. W. W., which is still in session as this is written, shows that no man could be a true friend of industrial unionism and not be an enemy of De Leonism. The present convention has so far been a farce. A bunch of half-crazed fanatics, under the leadership of De Leon obstructed business to such an extent that over a week was expended in passing upon credentials.

Wherever the foul hand of the S. L. P. has touched the I. W. W. the latter organization has withered up into a clique of fanatical freaks, who work only with Samson's instrument of warfare, and from which all *bona fide* laborers draw back in disgust.

Steadily all those who were working to make the I. W. W. a force in the American labor movement are beginning to realize this, and many of those who heaped their denunciations upon the head of the editor of the INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW six months ago are now even more emphatic in announcing his sentiments than was the original author. For instance, here is what Comrade O'Neill has to say in a recent issue of the *Miners' Magazine*: "It is now apparent to us that S. L. P. ism has hooked itself to the Industrial Workers of the World, in order that it might gather sustenance to prolong the life of an invalid that is almost a corpse. The convention at Chicago must either get rid of the fanatics and disrupters or the I. W. W. is slated for destruction. If fanaticism and insanity upon the part of the S. L. P. are proofs of being 'Class Conscious' then we must plead guilty of not being 'Class Crazy.' The *Magazine* will not be made a sewer to carry off the filth of calumniators, who glory in the use of vituperation and slander."

If the I. W. W. is wrecked on the crooked snag of DeLeonism, how will those friends of industrial unionism who feared to say what they thought and knew at the last convention excuse themselves?

# SOCIALISM ABROAD

The *Socialistische Monatshefte* has recently compiled a table showing the socialist representation in the various parliamentary bodies in Europe, which is given herewith:

## NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIVES.

<i>Country</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Socialist</i>
Denmark .....	114	24
Germany .....	397	78
Belgium .....	166	30
France .....	584	76
Holland .....	100	7
Sweden .....	230	13
England .....	670	30
Norway .....	117	5
Italy .....	508	21
Austria .....	325	11
Switzerland .....	167	2
Servia .....	160	1

## RUSSIA.

News has just come that Comrades Parvus and Leo Deutsch have been sent to Siberia. They have not only been sentenced to Siberia, but to the little village of Turuschausk, having less than 200 inhabitants and located in the extreme northern province, on the very edge of the Polar Circle.

The Berlin *Vorwärts*, in commenting on these two men says: "The name of Deutsch rivals that of Parvus in the esteem and trust of the German comrades. He is a memorial of one of the darkest pages of German history. In the year 1884 he was made the sacrifice of Bismarck's service of love for his Russian neighbor. Deutsch had escaped from the imprisonment of the czar and sought asylum in Switzerland. When in the above year he ventured to visit Germany he was arrested in Freiburg and transported to Russia. So it is that the name of Deutsch is connected with the inhumanity which brings the blush of shame into every honor-loving German. For sixteen years, as he has told us in his book, 'Sixteen Years in Siberia,' Deutsch endured the horrors of Siberia, yet they could not break the spirit of this youthful revolutionist. In 1901 Deutsch fled from Siberia and reached once more a protecting asylum in Europe. But no sooner had the news of the Russian revolution reached him than he, fearlessly obeying only his duty, hastened over the borders,—



there where the prison-cell threatened,—and threw himself into the ranks of the fighters; and now at fifty-one years of age he goes once more over that same road of tears, which he traveled at the age of thirty-nine.

"Just as we unite with the name of Deutsch the remembrance of those sixteen fearful years during which he was offered up by the German government as a prey to Russia, so Parvus is united to us with the memory of the years of labor in common. He belonged to us. We may proudly say that the German Social Democracy offered him a field for his work when the reaction in Russia made the activity of socialist publicists and theoreticians impossible. But all the German Social Democracy gave Comrade Parvus he has returned with usurious interest. He placed at their service a brilliant pen and a deep knowledge, together with tireless hours of work; all this until he was called to practical work, until the revolution called. In the stormy days of October, he went to St. Petersburg and fought in those bloody days in which the czar was at last forced to take the first steps toward constitutional government and the calling of the duma. For a short time in the spring days of the first freedom of the press he edited the young socialist paper in St. Petersburg, *The Natschlo*. Then rose the waves of the counter-revolution, broke over him and carried him away into the prison-cell, and now on to Siberia.

"All honor to the brave and the true! Deutsch and Parvus, these two names will be written together in the golden book of Social Democracy and will lead thousands upon thousands to sacrificial activity."

#### AUSTRALIA.

The attitude of the Australian socialists is shown in the following extract from an editorial from *The Socialist* of Melbourne:

"As Socialists, we cannot support opponents of Socialism, no matter what fine fellows they may be in other directions; and it is no secret that in the ranks of labor are some who have no knowledge of socialist principles, and therefore no appreciation therefor. Such persons must never expect to get the backing of Socialists, but we must on the other hand sensibly and generously allow for past environment, and not forget that many are actively engaged in courageously fighting with the proletariat in The Great Class War, who have no clear intellectual grasp of the science of industrial and social economics.

Not to allow for and properly appreciate this fact would mean that we should soon become doctrinaire, exclusive, pedantic, and narrow, and therefore should soon become comparatively useless and perhaps even mischievous. Therefore, whilst we must ever hold up the ideal of Class-Conscious, International, Revolutionary Socialism, we must rejoice when we see men break away from the support of the orthodox parties, whether called Liberal or Tory, Freetrade or Protectionist, Democratic or Republican, and resolve that henceforth they will unite as Labor men and take their stand against the Capitalist parties.

This is the first stage in the War of the Classes as regards the attitude of the masses, and those who thus sever themselves from the old orders are in a fair way to receive and make use of sound economic knowledge.

For Socialists to antagonize this section by denouncing them because they do not yet see clearly what is meant by the economic interpretation of history, or are unable to discern the differences between the Socialism of our French comrades, Jean Allemane and Jean-Leon Jaures, or our German stalwarts, Bebel and Bernstein, would show our unfitness to educate and organize to great and glorious Socialist victories the mass of the people."

Those who tell us that Australia has solved the unemployed problem

may be somewhat shocked by the following headline taken from *The Socialist* of Melbourne: "Five Thousand Male Wage Workers out of Employment in Melbourne.—Thirteen Thousand out of Work in Victoria. Three Thousand Women Wage Workers in Enforced Idleness,—Two Hundred Thousand Existing Below the Poverty Line."

## SWEDEN.

The trade union congress of Sweden which recently met at Stockholm reported that the membership increased from 39,570 in 1903 to 108,000, with an income of 4,460,746 kronin. The principal subject of discussion before the convention was the question of the adoption of a more consolidated form of organization. No definite conclusion was reached, but the general feeling of the convention seemed to be that such a step would be soon necessary.

## ENGLAND.

The trade union congress which has just been held had 491 delegates, representing 1,554,000 members. Resolutions were adopted endorsing old-age pensions and for the establishment of a daily paper representing the trade union position. The organization also agreed to gather funds for the Russian revolution. One of the interesting phases was the adoption of a resolution which was practically a repudiation of Maddison in his campaign against Comrade Hyndman. This was carried by a vote of 756 to 543.

## SWITZERLAND.

The reactionary movement continues. The Zurich government has recently expelled Emil Hauth, one of the editors of the socialist daily of Zurich, although he had been a resident of Zurich for over eleven years. The excuse was that he was a foreigner without papers. Another socialist comrade, Sigg, has just been sentenced to eight months imprisonment for circulating an anti-military leaflet. It would seem that these actions were at last beginning to awaken the workers, since at a by-election for a judge the socialist vote rose from 5,000 to more than 10,000.

## JAPAN.

From the *Hikari* we learn the explanation of street-car riots which have been reported in the daily press. It seems that the three street railroad companies of Tokio, having amalgamated and watered their capital and thereby proved how far they were advanced on the road to civilization, proceeded to give further evidence of that progress by raising their rates of fare. *The Socialist* printed tens of thousands of leaflets urging that the street cars be boycotted. This was the situation when the last number of *Hikari* to reach us was printed. The Associated Press dispatches state that this boycott was so very effective that government troops were called out and that for several days Tokio was practically in the hands of the rioters.

# THE WORLD OF LABOR

BY MAX S. HAYES

The political pot continues to boil, and whether the American labor movement is coming out of this year's experiment without being scalded more or less only the future will determine. The results in Vermont and Maine were not altogether satisfactory, nor were they completely disappointing. The A. F. of L. officials set out to assist the Democrats—to reward their friends and punish their enemies, as the Ghibboleth rings. But it appears that these self-same Democrats are not the least bit grateful for the support volunteered by Mr. Gompers and colleagues. Although the Republican majorities in Vermont and Maine were cut down materially, the Democratic politicians and newspapers profess to believe that their gains were due solely to their own brilliant management as well as the mistakes of the Republicans in enforcing obnoxious temperance laws, while local issues are also claimed to have cut some figure. And just to show how well the old rascals understand each other, the Republicans are saying amen to everything that the Bourbons claim in the endeavor to ignore their labor allies. In fact, Congressman Littlefield, who had over four thousand votes chopped off his majority of two years ago, is out with a statement to the effect that the Republicans made so many mistakes that he was in danger of defeat until Gompers came into the district to attack him, whereupon his election was assured. But that's all tommyrot. Gompers and his friends did contribute to the increased vote of the Democrats, and the actions of the latter only serve once more to display the contemptible snobbishness and base ingratitude for which their party is notorious. They seduced the Greenback, Union Labor and People's parties, and gave them not the least credit for victories gained anywhere, and now they are attempting to betray the trade union movement to their capitalistic devil. Ever so often the Democratic street-walker hunts for some victim while her Republican pal stands around the corner anxiously waiting to share the spoil. It's a blamed good thing for the Socialist movement that William Jennings Bryan and his single tax and individualistic-anarchistic friends are taking a fall out of socialism. The national committee of the Socialist party could well afford to hire Mr. Bryan (as an attorney, of course,) to go about the country and pummel the party to his heart's content. The safety of the Socialist party lies in its revolutionary character; if it were a mere reform aggregation it would meet the fate of the Pops and others. Hence it is not difficult to foresee that Gompers, unless he keeps on moving until he lands squarely in the Socialist camp, is going to fall into the meshes of one of the old adventuresses and have his usefulness destroyed forever. So long as he held aloof from old party entanglements, Gompers was respected, but familiarity breeds contempt, and when once they have used him the Federation president will be pushed into a sarcophagus and laid alongside of the long line of reformers who were trapped during the past forty years. The world's history proves that

wherever men espoused a cause, rallied their supporters about them and fought for their principles and ideals they made progress. But where they crawled into the camp of the enemy on their bellies they were shown little mercy.

While Gompers appears to be attempting to curry favor with the Democratic bosses, there being only Republican Congressmen on his blacklist, First Vice-President James Duncan seems to be more stalwart and truly independent. In his Cleveland speech on Labor Day, Mr. Duncan made liberal use of socialist phrases, as the following excerpts from his address will show:

"Give your support, wherever possible, to union men. We may not hope to win in the first attempt, but if consistent in our efforts we will in the end accomplish our aim."..... "Labor should control capital and politics. Politics without our blind support would be less tyrannical. There is no law of nature that would permit the idle man to rule. It is usurpation. The producer should be the master."..... "Every movement must have some motive. Ours must be an industrial democracy. We must work to the common end of uplifting the laborer. We must step into politics with our coats off and our demands made plain. There must be no hesitation, no uncertainty in our position and efforts. We must draw the line and hew to it."

You will notice that Duncan has made considerable progress since the New Orleans and Boston conventions, where he pooh-poohed political action, an industrial democracy, that labor should own the product of its toil, etc. Duncan is pretty shrewd and far-seeing in many respects, and evidently does not fear to change his opinions to conform to new conditions. Mitchell doesn't appear to be advancing any—at least I haven't heard of his desire to back any of the scores of miners who are candidates on the Socialist ticket. Lennon pretends to be progressive, but it's a question whether he will ever get ahead of the most slowpoke tailor in the country. There is little use in discussing other members of the executive council of the Federation. They are a mighty slow lot. But there is one thing that the old crowd has done and for which they deserve unalloyed credit, and that is, the Vermont and Maine campaigns have riveted and clinched the movement inaugurated in the "bill of grievances" to engage in politics. If it is good union tactics to discuss Democratic and Republican politics in local organizations and central bodies at this juncture, there is every reason why it is better policy to talk socialism. This is the opportunity that Socialists have wanted and fought for during the past dozen years. Now it is up to the "reds" to make their presence known, and to point out the damages of hanging to the coat-tails of alleged friends in the capitalist parties as well as the advantages to be gained by joining the only political working class movement deserving the name—the Socialist party. There are scores of young Socialists in the unions who can break in as speakers, and hundreds of others who can purchase a dollar's worth of literature and aim to educate their fellow-workers. There is work to be done, and if every Socialist in the unions will do his share there need be no fear of Gompers and his crowd delivering the so-called labor vote to one party and then another. The men will deliver their own votes and to their own party.

From all appearances, the good, old jurisdiction controversies will be trotted out again at the Minneapolis convention of the A. F. of L. next month. While they had a beginning in the dim and misty past, they don't seem to have an end. Like the poet's brook, they go on forever. The brewery workers have once more been given to understand that they must quietly allow themselves to be disrupted, but they refuse to bow to the mandate of the A. F. of L. officials. At a recent session of the Federation executive council the brewers were commanded to give up the engineers, firemen, teamsters and other workmen that some craft



captain wanted or take the consequences, which were, first, that all boycotts now levied in favor of the brewers by the A. F. of L. would be invalidated, and, secondly, that the Federation's indorsement of the brewers' union label would be withdrawn. Just how such a novel proceeding would be regarded by the union membership throughout the country can well be imagined—for there is no question but that the big-hearted, liberal brewery workers, who are always digging into their treasuries to assist somebody, have the overwhelming majority of the rank and file with them in their fight for life against envious craft officials as well as bosses' combines. The unprecedented action of giving up a boycott against an unfair house, withdrawing from the field when a battles rages, and yet collect taxes from the affiliated organization in trouble could have been planned nowhere else except in the fertile think-tank of Gompers or Secretary Morrison—the latter has recently become a great jurisdiction fixer. Then, again, to come out before the public and announce that the brewers' union label is not a label, is no better than some bogus, scabby capitalistic trade-mark, and all the time collecting per capita tax from the brewers with the avowed purpose of assisting them directly and indirectly, will be about as fine an exhibition of pure and simple muddle-headedness as this funny old world has ever witnessed. Talk about the I. W. W. or some other rival organization boycotting established and recognized labels, here we will have an example, if the executive council's threat is made good, of a federated body boycotting one of its own labels. Just why the fool-killer should neglect his business during hot weather is a mystery. The annual contests between the seamen and longshoremen, the carpenters and woodworkers, etc., will, of course, be pulled off on schedule time, but none are as bitterly attacked by the dominant faction and as boldly marked for slaughter and disruption as the brewers. The general impression is that the brewery workers are so unmercifully pursued by Gompers, O'Connell and Morrison because they have repeatedly declared for socialism, and, as Gompers is an anarchist and O'Connell and Morrison are nothing, this is an unpardonable sin that calls for severe punishment. In fact, Gompers' every move since the New Orleans convention, where he narrowly escaped losing his grip, has been a studied, persistent wet-nursing of a policy to force the outspoken Socialists from the Federation family. The dirtiest types of grafters, like the Judas Henry Weissmann, the unspeakable Harry White, the notorious and powerful Bill Pomeroy, and others of that character who have always embraced every opportunity to attack the Socialists, not with logical, tolerant argument, but with vulgar, ill-tempered invective, have always been Gompers' warmest friends and were given ready ear. I don't say that Gompers is corrupt—on the contrary, in my opinion he is a man of unimpeachable integrity and honest to the core in financial matters. But he has been in mighty bad company and is not over-scrupulous in using anybody and everybody to defeat an opponent and keep himself on top. Gompers sees the rising tide of socialism and is making a desperate attempt to sweep it back, even if it is necessary to excommunicate and break up some organization as a warning to others to be good. The plan of the inside bunch all along has been to make things so unbearable for the brewers as to cause them to withdraw. Then they could be treated as seceders and bombarded accordingly. But the brewers refused to withdraw and are waiting to be kicked out. There is no denying the fact that if the brewers are finally forced from the Federation there will be a shake-up of some dimensions. It is almost certain that other organizations would follow in short order, to say nothing of many individuals. Whether they would go into the I. W. W. or form a new federation would, quite naturally, depend upon circumstances. What with the continuous performance of jurisdiction strife, the injection of a peculiar political policy where the average unionist doesn't know

## INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW.

"where he is at," the ceaseless activity of the employers' associations to enforce their open shop schemes, and the natural centralization of capital and developments in industry, we are being driven toward a crisis in the trade union movement that will require extraordinary clever management to prevent the good ship from being severely damaged in troublous waters.

An internal row that is creating a great deal of interest among the cigarmakers began recently between ex-President Strasser and Organizer Best on the one side and Boston Union No. 97 on the other. The Boston cigarmakers had made a demand for increased wages and Strasser and Best were sent to the front by the international officers to take charge of the movement, but it seems that they hobnobbed too much with the enemy to please No. 97. It is claimed that the international representatives so far offended against the spirit of unionism as to openly denounce their fellow-members in the presence of the manufacturers during a conference as being ignorant and disloyal, and also attempted to force the Boston workers to remain satisfied with the old wage rate. Strasser's only reply to the statement of the union (which has a membership of 2,200 and is one of the most powerful locals in the country) was an intemperate tirade in which everybody who has the temerity to question his methods is denounced as a Socialist snake, yellow dog, etc., etc. The controversy has attracted a great deal of attention and Strasser's peculiar actions have made him no friends. As in many other local organizations, the active workers in Boston union are Socialists, but why they should be abused for trying to get more money for the membership is difficult to comprehend. Even though they are ignoramuses and snakes, and Mr. Strasser and his friends are intelligent giants and paragons of virtue, still the rank and file who pay dues must eat, or they would all die and then the union would go to pieces and then the Strassers would have to go to work for a living and such a cruel blow might kill father, too!

## BOOK REVIEWS

THE VOICE OF THE STREET, by Ernest Poole. A. S. Barnes & Co.  
Cloth, 282 pp., \$1.50.

There is a strange almost mystical charm about it that clings to you and haunts you after you have lain the book down. It comes back to you days afterwards. It makes you realize what a really remarkable work it is. Truly, it is the "Voice of the Street." The "Street," fierce, lying, gambling, devouring, competitive, drags at the hero it has produced. A newsboy with a wonderful Voice.—always spell that Voice with a capital—joins with "Dago Joe" in a partnership, where one plays and the other sings. The Voice reaches ever up for higher things. The Street ever drags it down. An old German musician discovers the Voice and takes its owner home with him. Gretchen lives with her father, the old German musician. Then the struggle between the Voice and the Street is complicated with a romance. Sometimes the Street drags all down for a moment. The Voice is sweated in a music hall, is exploited and coined into dollars for the proprietor—to draw in "champagne customers." When "Lucky Jim,"—who owns the Voice—or does the Voice own him?—finally escapes from this place, he cannot earn the money with which to take lessons. Joe, his old partner, ever faithful, though never escaping the iron grip of the Street, steals the money for the lessons. When Jim suspects the source of the money and refuses to take it, Joe brings it to Gretchen, and together, for the sake of the Voice, they pretend that the money comes from a friend in Germany. When Joe is unsuccessful, Gretchen finally is driven also to steal, always to keep the Voice from the Street, that is ever beckoning Jim back to take one more gambler's chance. Then comes exposure, Gretchen's imprisonment, and then out of it all the Voice triumphs, carries its possessor to the Metropolitan Opera House, with Gretchen present to hear—and waiting for the singer when the song is finished.

We do not know what others will read in the story, but the socialist need not stretch his imagination to see capitalism in the Street, struggling with the constructive, artistic free Voice of the coming age. Nor do we think the writer will quarrel with this reading, since he whispers the same story in his final paragraph. Here is what he makes the Voice say in the hour of its triumph:—

"Come—for the life we dreamed of is here. Come—forever closer, closer to me; hear what I hear, see what I see, feel what I feel. Open your eyes and your ears and your soul to the World of Big Beauties with me. Be glad—for the Street is forever behind us; the fight, the race, the lie, the gamble—are only parts of death. Deep under the glare and roar of the street—life—real life—is silently waiting for the time when men shall no longer be blind and deaf. Be glad—for the Age of the Street will forever pass to make way for the Age of the Song. Be glad—for life—real life—is not murder of the weak by the mighty

Be glad—for life is creation—the race where each helps his brother, that Big Beauty may come first ahead! Be glad—for life is the birth and the growth of beauty and joy for all! Be glad—for life is love!”

---

LIFE AND DEATH, A STUDY IN BIOLOGY, by *Dr. E. Teichmann*. Translated by *A. M. Simons*.

“Samuel speaks: ‘Science will not suffice. Sooner or later you will end by coming to your knees.’ Goetze: ‘Before what?’ Samuel: ‘Before the darkness.’”—Villiers *De L’Isle Adam*.

This bit of dialogue from a celebrated French play reflects the mental attitude to which most imaginative men come when they desert fact for speculation and seek to compass in thought the final causes of things.

It is the attitude of Omar in the tenth as of Herbert Spencer in the nineteenth century. It is hinted at in the latest utterances of Prof. Ernest Haeckel and in the earliest listings of Greek philosophy. We are not surprised, therefore, to find this state of mind reflected in the essay before us. But to those who feel with the translator that this view savors too much of theology, it may be urged that certainly no where else in the book is there any indication of theological bias. On the contrary, the author’s treatment of his subject seems to us scientific from beginning to end.

We have here a study of life phenomena as they are revealed in the simplest organisms. Experiment after experiment is brought before us, each so selected as to show us some forward step taken in organic evolution, all so graphically described that the reader’s attention is never for an instant taxed to the point of weariness. Indeed we can say of this little volume what we are seldom able to predicate of similar studies, that it manages to be most entertaining without losing its value from the standpoint of science.

We are shown how life appears, how it reproduces itself; we view the transmission of qualities from parent to offspring by means of the division of nuclear substance. We are carried through a discussion of the origin of life, without, however, receiving any answer to our question, Whence have we come? Last and most interesting of all is the inquiry into the subject of death. What Dr. Teichmann says on this point is full of an unexpected encouragement to those sensitive spirits to whom death makes life a tragedy. One takes leave of this essayist with the same mingling of regret and satisfaction which one feels after an evening spent with a helpful and inspiring friend.

LILIAN HILLER UDELL.



## PUBLISHERS' DEPARTMENT

### WHAT WE DID IN SEPTEMBER.

We broke all records. We close the month with 1511 stockholders to \$1,520.90 as compared with \$1,420.76 in August, and we also distributed books to the amount of \$225 at retail prices among new purchasers of stock. The total cash receipts of the month were \$2,235.37, the largest receipts for any one month in the whole history of the publishing house.

All this is simply a beginning. It merely proves that in our co-operative organization we have found the way to circulate the books that the socialist movement needs. Up to this time we have in a way been experimenting. That stage is over now, and it is time for us to do things. We have been printing books in small editions because we could not raise the money to pay for large ones. We shall not be handicapped in that way much longer. We shall add to our list of stockholders faster now than ever before, because we have reached the point where any one who wishes to purchase any considerable number of socialist books can get more for his money by becoming a stockholder in this publishing house than in any other way. With the books now in press we shall have a fairly adequate variety of the best literature of socialism. We shall go on increasing the variety by bringing out new books, but the thing that needs doing most urgently is to give a wider circulation to the books we have.

### MAGAZINE ADVERTISING.

We are already in touch with practically all the members of the Socialist Party who are book-buyers. But the number of socialist voters in the United States is nearly twenty times the number of party members, and beyond the socialist voters are millions more of Americans who have already come to see that some radical change is needed in our political and industrial systems, and are ready to welcome the literature of socialism when once they know of it.

The most intelligent and wide-awake of these people can be reached through the popular magazines, which are now filled with articles exposing the shams of capitalism, while pointing out no adequate remedy. These same magazines have lately opened their pages to classified ad-

vertising, so that a moderate expenditure each month in each of them will keep before their readers the fact that we have the books that tell what they want to know. This method of advertising is a new experiment with us, and whether it will pay for itself in direct returns remains to be seen. Meanwhile in connection with the new experiment we are developing our work along lines that have proved effective.

### WHAT TO READ ON SOCIALISM.

The first edition of this book contained 32 pages, 6 by 3 1-2 inches. It was large enough to describe all the books we had then. Two editions of ten thousand each were circulated in that shape. Then it was enlarged to 36 pages the size of the REVIEW. An introduction on "The Central Thing in Socialism" was added, and the books were better described. Besides, there were more of them to describe: we had been growing. Thirty thousand copies were circulated in this shape; then for a while the book was out of print and we had only a condensed price list of books to circulate.

Last March we made an entirely new set of plates of "What to Read on Socialism." For the introduction we used a series of five articles by Charles H. Kerr on "What Socialists Think," which had previously had a wide circulation in the form of five separate leaflets. The books of the publishing house were more adequately described than ever before, and there were more of them to describe. Twenty-five thousand of these were circulated in March, April and May, and in June, when the "dull season" is due, we found to our surprise that more of these books were needed, so we printed twenty-five thousand more of them, with a few slight changes from the March edition.

This book contained 64 large pages, the paper being the size of the REVIEW, but the margins narrower, so that each page of print contained as much matter as a page of Everybody's or the Cosmopolitan. A copy was mailed to each of our regular correspondents, and on the front page an announcement was printed to the effect that copies would be mailed for one cent each, or sent by express at purchaser's expense for fifty cents a hundred. Over thirty thousand of these books have been sold in this way, for the reason that at these prices they are beyond comparison the best socialist propaganda matter that can be bought for the price.

There have been just two complaints from the comrades using these books for distribution. One comrade objected on the ground that a few pages of the book list described "love stories." No one else made the same complaint, but in any case the clearance list of the old books which the company brought out before 1899 will be dropped from the next edition to make room for a full description of Marx's "Capital," Morgan's "Ancient Society," and other new and standard books which we have already added to our list. The other complaint was a more serious one. It was that the paper used was so thin that the print showed through and made reading difficult. The reason for this was that in the last two editions we kept the weight down in order that the book might go by



mail for one cent. We have come to the conclusion that this defect interferes seriously with the usefulness of the book, and with the next edition, which will be ready within a few days after this issue of the REVIEW is in the hands of its readers, we shall increase the weight and thickness of the paper. The postage on single copies will hereafter cost us two cents, and the books themselves in the largest quantities will cost us at least twelve dollars a thousand. We shall however as before mail copies for one cent each and supply the books by express at purchaser's expense for 50c a hundred. This we can afford to do because all copies judiciously circulated will increase the demand for our literature and help us find new stockholders.

Our reason for charging for the books at all is to prevent their being wasted. We "can't change human nature," as the opponents of socialism often remind us, and it is human nature to waste what costs us nothing.

This company will mail one copy of "What to Read" free of charge to any one asking for it, but it will not mail copies to a list of names unless one cent is sent for each name. The cost to us is over three cents for each name, and we require the payment of one cent each simply to remind the senders to exercise care in the selection of names and send none but those of people likely to read the book when they get it.

Do not send for more copies of this book than you can use to good advantage, but send for these at once. The edition of twenty-five thousand copies that we are now printing ought to be used in a month.

### THE NEW BOOKS.

Printers do not always keep their promises, and it is often difficult for us to tell in advance just how soon a new book can be ready. Some of the comrades who have placed advance orders for books that have been announced may be growing impatient. We will therefore try and explain definitely regarding each of the books in preparation.

*The Physical Basis of Mind and Morals*, by M. H. Fitch (\$1.00) was already printed and in the bindery on Oct. 1, and apart from accidents should have been ready by the time this issue of the REVIEW is out.

*The Positive Outcome of Philosophy*, by Joseph Dietzgen (\$1.00) was nearly printed on Oct. 1, and should be out about the same time with this issue of the REVIEW.

*Social and Philosophical Studies*, by Paul Lafargue (50c) and *What's So and What Isn't*, by John M. Work (50c) were electrotyped and ready for the press on Oct. 1, and should be out of the bindery on the 15th.

The final proof reading on the plates of the first volume of *Capital* is just about completed. As the book is a very large one the printing and binding will still take some time and it will be November before copies can be ready.

The proofs of Askew's translation of Kautsky's *Ethics and the Materialistic Conception of History* have just been returned by Comrade Askew from Switzerland, and apart from accident this book should be ready in November. (50c).

The type is nearly set on Comrade Untermann's translation of Labriola's *Socialism and Philosophy* (\$1.00) and it will probably be ready in November.

Morgan's *Ancient Society* (\$1.50) is in the printers' hands, but progress on this is slower than we had counted on. We now expect to publish it early in December.

*Class Struggles in America*, by A. M. Simons, revised, with notes and references, will be published in the Standard Socialist Series at 50c some time in November.

Other books are in preparation, but we will reserve the particulars until we can announce the date at which the volumes can be ready.

### THE FUTURE OF THE REVIEW.

The one weak point in the receipts of September was the INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW. We received for subscriptions and sales \$123.47, while the necessary monthly expenses are at least \$200.00. This deficit has continued for some time, and there has consequently been some doubt as to the continuance of the REVIEW.

The problem for the immediate future has now been solved by a pledge from Comrade Eugene Dietzgen to pay \$1,000 a year for two years beginning Jan. 1, 1907, part of the money to be used in paying for special contributions from the leading socialist writers of Europe, and the remainder to apply directly on the deficit.

THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST REVIEW has always been regarded as valuable, indeed indispensable, by the ablest and best informed socialists. The difficulty in finding enough subscribers to pay the cost of publication in the past has been mainly due to the prevailing impression that the REVIEW was intended only for people who were highly educated. This impression was not well founded, since a large proportion of those who read it year after year are men whose higher education has been gained mainly from the socialist movement itself.

In future, while the high standard of excellence for articles will be maintained, every effort will be made to popularize the REVIEW, bringing it within the comprehension of any one willing to study socialism.

There are plenty of propaganda sheets, and the REVIEW does not compete with them. Its purpose is not to show the man in the street why he should vote the socialist ticket. He is being shown by the readers of the REVIEW, and its object is to qualify these readers to write better articles and leaflets, make better speeches, and talk to their neighbors in a more convincing way.

Every member of the Socialist Party will be a more efficient worker if he reads the REVIEW. Every impartial student of International Socialism will get a clearer idea of it from a regular reading of the REVIEW than from any other periodical. If those who need the REVIEW subscribe for it, the cost of publication will be covered and no burden will fall on any one.

### COMBINATION OFFER: REVIEW AND BOOKS.

To introduce the REVIEW quickly we make the following offers. They are not limited to stockholders and they apply to former subscribers as well as the new ones:

For \$1.15 we will send the REVIEW one year and any one of our 50c books postpaid.

For \$1.30 we will send the REVIEW one year and two of our 50c books or any one of our dollar books postpaid.

For \$2.00 we will send the REVIEW one year and the first volume of "Capital" (ready in November), or any two of our dollar books, or any four of our 50c books, postpaid.

The books need not necessarily be sent to the same address as the REVIEW. A book list will be sent to any one requesting it. This offer of course applies only to our own books; we do not sell books of other publishers.

Show this offer to your comrades and send in their subscriptions. A united effort will put the REVIEW on a self-supporting basis and enable us to improve it continuously.